DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 157 SP 005 562

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | An Evaluation of (TIF) Teacher Innovation Funds Awards Program. Parts I and II. |
| INSTITUTION | District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | Oct 71 |
| NOTE | 104p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Educational Innovation; *Effective Teaching; *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Developed Materials; *Teacher Participation |

ABSTRACT

This evaluation report is in two main sections, the first dealing with a program in five senior high school areas and involving 96 teachers during 1968-70, the second dealing with a program in one high school and one vocational high school and involving 43 teachers during 1970-71. The programs were established to seek out and fund innovative classroom projects designed by teachers and to demonstrate the school system's faith in the ability and creativity of the individual teacher. All teachers, librarians, counselors, and specialists were eligible to submit proposals, and a committee selected those to be funded. Background information was gathered through interviews, on-site visitations, and seminars using instruments such as a pre-evaluation questionnaire, an evaluation checklist, a post-evaluation questionnaire, and a creativity impact measure. Results indicated a very positive teacher reaction, with many valuable innovative projects. Teachers gained skills in using new techniques, new enriching experiences were provided for the students, learning was improved, attitudes were changed, and improvement was made in oral and written communication. New ideas and techniques were publicized for use by non-involved teachers giving incentives for others to try innovative projects. (MBM)

ED 061157

SP

N-SG

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# AN EVALUATION OF

# (TIF)

# TEACHER INNOVATION FUND AWARDS PROGRAM

PART I

PART II

Prepared by

Department of Research and Evaluation

Division of Planning, Innovation and Research

10/71

SP005562

PART I

The Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program was funded by an Appropriated Budget for the Public School Teacher Innovation Fund and by the Philip M. Stern Family Foundation.

Sponsored by
The
Office of Staff Development

Public Schools of the District of Columbia

| | |
|---|---|
| Superintendent of Schools | Hugh J. Scott |
| Associate Superintendent-Instructional Services | James C. Guines |

Division of Planning, Innovation and Research
Department of Research and Evaluation

| | |
|---|---|
| Department Head | Mildred P. Cooper |
| Secretary | Rozelia M. Stewart |
| Educational Research and Planning Associate | Herman Cobb, Jr. |

Office of Staff Development

| | |
|---|---|
| Director | Elizabeth Williams |
| Program Coordinator | Irene S. Rich |

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| LIST OF TABLES | | iv |
| Summary | | v, vi |
| Chapter | | |
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | Background and Rationale | 1 |
| | Purpose of Study | 1 |
| | Definitions | 1 |
| | Delimitations | 1 |
| II. | PROCEDURE | 2 |
| | Sample | 2 |
| | Instruments | 2 |
| | Collection of Data | 2 |
| | Analysis of Data | 3 |
| III. | RESULTS | 3 |
| IV. | DISCUSSION | 23-25 |
| V. | CONCLUSIONS | 25-26 |
| VI. | RECOMMENDATIONS | 26 |
| VII. | APPENDIXES | |
| | A. Participants' Pre-Questionnaire | 27 |
| | B. Participants' Post-Questionnaire | 33 |
| | C. Round I Participants; Schools; Project Titles, and Grade Levels Taught | 40 |
| | D. Round II Participants; Schools; Project Titles, and Grade Levels Taught | 45 |

LIST OF TABLES


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Number of Years Teaching Experience ..... | 3 |
| II. | Sources of Information About the Existence TIF..... | 4 |
| III. | Reasons For Seeking an Award (Pre) and Benefits Received (Post) | 5 |
| | a. Round I Pre ..... | 5 |
| | b. Round II Pre ..... | 6 |
| | c. Round I Post ..... | 6 |
| IV. | Sources of Help in Preparing Project Proposals ..... | 7 |
| V. | Amount of Time Spent Preparing Proposals ..... | 7 |
| VI. | Teachers' Expectations For Proposal Approval..... | 8 |
| VII. | Amount of Time Needed to Get Project Started After Funding..... | 8 |
| VIII. | Reaction of the Principals and Other School Personnel to the Project..... | 9 |
| IX. | Problems In Implementation of Projects..... | 9 |
| | a. Round I Pre..... | 10 |
| | b. Round II Pre..... | 11 |
| | c. Round I Post..... | 12 |
| X. | Anticipated and Actual Teaching Techniques and Procedures.... | 13 |
| XI. | Participants' Expected Project Outcomes..... | 13 |
| XII. | The Degree to Which Learning Was Improved..... | 14 |
| XIII. | Used to Measure Project Outcomes..... | 14 |
| XIV. | Ratings of Expectations (Round I and II Pre) and Outcomes (Round I Post)..... | 15 |
| XV. | Ratings of Statements Supporting Tables III & XI..... | 16 |
| XVI. | Techniques and Procedures Which Proved Most Helpful In Implementation..... | 17 |
| XVII. | The Way A Volunteer Aide Would Be Utilized..... | 19 |
| XVIII. | Elements to be Included in A Summery Report..... | 20 |
| XIX. | Results Accomplished Through Publication of A Summary Report. | 20 |
| XX. | The Degree to Which Help Was Received..... | 21 |
| XXI. | Forms of Communication Between the Office of Staff Development and TIF Winners Ranked According to Effectiveness..... | 22 |
| XXII. | Format For the Composite Evaluation..... | 22 |

## Evaluation Summary

Title: Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program

Project Location: Public Schools in the following Senior High School areas:

1. Wilson
2. Western
3. Roosevelt
4. Spingarn
5. Eastern

Date: School Years 1968-69; 1969-70

Target Population: 2156 Teachers

Number Served: 96 Teachers

Staff: Coordinated by the Office of Staff Development

Funding Allotment: $200 per Teacher plus auxillary funds

Background and Rationale:

The Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program was established to seek out and fund innovative classroom projects designed by teachers. It was designed to demonstrate the school system's faith in the ability and creativity of the individual teacher. The program sought to supply teachers with resources and support needed to test their own solutions as they sought to meet the instructional needs of their students.

Procedures:

All teachers, librarians, and counselors in the target population were invited to submit proposals for innovative classroom projects. Winning proposals were selected by an advisory committee. Awards were made based on the committee's judgement as to how well the proposals met certain criteria.

Evaluation Plan:

Background information was gathered through interviews with personnel from the Office of Staff Development. In cooperation with the Office of Staff Development, the Department of Research and Evaluation designed the following instruments which were sent to the Award Winners:

1. A Pre Evaluation Questionnaire
2. A Post Evaluation Questionnaire
3. A Creativity Impact Measure

Results and Discussion:

Feedback was received from eighty-five of the participants. Teachers with innovative projects taught Kindergarden through Senior High School. The main reasons for seeking an award were: (1) To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child; (2) A desire to explore new teaching techniques and; (3) To gain skill in a specific area. Though problems were encountered the participants felt that their reasons for seeking awards were fulfilled.

Through the use of small group instruction, individualized instruction and audio-visual aids the teachers expected to achieve three major outcomes: (1) improved learning; (2) changed attitudes and; (3) improved communications. Using student behavior, teacher observation and teacher-made tests as the main evaluation techniques it was determined that these outcomes were met to a great degree. The teachers felt that their projects had enough value to merit repeating.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

It was concluded that many valuable innovative projects were sought out, funded and tested by teachers in a variety of grade levels. Teachers gained skills in using new techniques, new enriching experiences were provided for the students, learning was improved, attitudes were changed and improvement was made in oral and written communication.

New ideas and techniques were publicized for use by non-involved teachers giving incentives for others to try innovative projects.

A continuation of the Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program is urged. A special effort should be made to eliminate the problems of ordering and receiving materials.

# INTRODUCTION

This is Part I of the evaluation of the Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program (TIF). Part I covers the program for the school years 1968-69 and 1969-70. Part II will include this year's program, 1970-71 plus a follow-up on participants included in Part I.

## Background and Rationale

The Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program was established to seek out and fund innovative classroom projects designed by teachers(either individually, or in teams.) It was designed to concretely demonstrate the school system's faith in recognition and support of the ability and creativity of the individual teacher. The program has sought to supply teachers with resources and support needed to test their own imaginative solutions to concerns within their school as they seek to meet the instructional needs of the students in their classes. Funding was limited to $200 per teacher and restricted to materials only. Teachers were free to use this amount at their own discretion in purchasing materials.

## Purpose of Study

This report attempts to give an overview of the program from its inception in 1968 through the present school year 1970-71. A great deal of weight is given to the responses of the TIF participants in making an assessment of the funding procedures, project support, the degree to which the project helped the teacher in working with children, the degree to which learning was improved, and also whether other favorable outcomes were apparent. It is hoped that any weaknesses and/or problems in the program will be uncovered so as to improve future TIF programs.

## Definitions

TIF Winners - Teacher Innovation Fund Award program participants who were awarded funds to carry out their individual or team projects.

Round I - the group of teachers awarded during school year 1968-69
Round II - the group of teachers awarded during school year 1969-70
Round III - the group of teachers awarded during school year 1970-71

Grants - Funding for projects in the amount of $200 per teacher for winning proposals

## Delimitations

Part I of this report presents a recent analysis of the available data collected during the school years 1968-69 and 1969-70. In most instances only percentages were available and the raw data were not present.

## PROCEDURE

### Sample

Round I participants were selected from a population of 920 teachers coming from selected schools located in three areas of the city; namely, Wilson and Western High Schools area, Roosevelt High School area, and Spingarn High School area. All teachers, librarians and counselors were invited to submit proposals involving innovative classroom projects.

An advisory committee composed of personnel from the Office of Staff Development evaluated each proposal received. Awards were made based on the committee's judgement as to how well the plans for the project focused on one or more of the following:

a. make curriculum relevant to children.
b. improve the skills of children through innovative teaching techniques.
c. actively involve children in the learning process.
d. individualize instruction.

Of the fifty-nine teachers submitting proposals to the Staff Development Office, thirty-nine were awarded TIF grants.

Participants for Round II were drawn from the Eastern-Springarn High Schools area. The population consisted of about 1236 teachers. From this population 96 proposals were received, of which 57 were funded. Again the awards were made on the recommendation of the advisory committee set up by the Office of Staff Development using the same criteria used in Round I.

### Instruments and Collection of Data

Pre- and post- questionnaires developed by the Department of Research and Evaluation were administered to the participants. Due to constraints of time, post-testing of the Round II group was not conducted. However, a follow-up questionnaire entitled "Creativity Impact Measure" developed by the Department of Research and Evaluation was recently administered to participants of Rounds I and II and will be analyzed in conjunction with the assessment of the current year's program. The results will be reported in Part II of this report.

Interviews were held with the staff of the Office of Staff Development. The team from the Department of Research and Evaluation also held a one day workshop with Round I participants wherein a model that teachers could use in evaluating a classroom project was presented.

Analysis of Data

Items calling for rank order were ranked in numerical order. Percentages were used to show the amount of responses for certain items on the questionnaires. Comparisons were made of the percentages to reveal the differences in responses between Rounds 1 and II participants and also between the pre and post responses of Round I. The results are shown in tabular and narrative form.

## RESULTS

Pre questionnaires were completed and returned by thirty-four Round I participants and fifty-one Round II participants. Thirty Round I participants completed the post instrument.

The table below shows the teaching experience of the participants.

Table I
Number of Years Teaching Experience

| Years | Number of Teachers | |
|---|---|---|
| | Round I | Round II |
| 1-4 | 8 | 19 |
| 5-9 | 10 | 11 |
| 10-14 | 3 | 7 |
| 15-19 | 3 | 9 |
| 20-29 | 3 | 0 |
| 30-39 | 1 | 2 |
| 40-49 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 29 | 48 |
| Mean Years Taught | 11.4 | 5.3 |

Schools, grade levels taught, and names of the innovative projects are shown in appendices C and D.

Table II presents the sources of information about the TIF program as cited by participating teachers.

Table II
Sources of Information About The Existence of TIF

| Source | Number Responding | |
|---|---|---|
| | Round I | Round II |
| The Principal | 20 | 29 |
| Central Office | 11 | 14 |
| Supervisor | 1 | 3 |
| Another Teacher | 1 | 3 |
| Other: | | |
| bulletin in teacher's room | 1 | 1 |
| union | - | 1 |
| Total Responding | 34 | 51 |

Teachers indicated their reasons for seeking an award by ranking each reason according to its importance from the most to the least. On the post the same items were listed as benefits received as a result of the project and again ranked from the most to the least. For this evaluation all rankings were determined by assigning a numerical value to the first three ranks indicated by the teachers. First choices received a weight of three; second a weight of two; and third a weight of one. Table III gives the overall rankings by each group. Tables III a, b and c give the breakdown for each group.

Table III
Reasons for Seeking An
Award (Pre) and Benefits Received (Post)

| Reasons | Pre | | Post |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Round I | Round II | Round I |
| To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| A desire to explore new teaching techniques | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| To gain additional skill in a specific teaching area | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Self-developed competency in a particular area | 4.5 | 5 | 5 |
| Specialized training in a particular area | 4.5 | 4 | 4 |

Table III a.
Round I Pre

| Reasons | Teachers Indicating Each Rank | | | Percent Ranking 1st-3rd | Total Responding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | | |
| 1. To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child | 26 | 7 | 1 | 100 | 34 |
| 2. A desire to explore new teaching techniques | 8 | 18 | 4 | 88 | 34 |
| 3. To gain additional skill in a specific teaching area | 0 | 5 | 10 | 44 | 34 |
| 4. Self-developed competency in a particular area | 0 | 1 | 14 | 44 | 34 |
| 5. Specialized training in a particular area | 1 | 3 | 7 | 32 | 34 |

Table III b.
Round II Pre

| Reasons | Teachers Indicating Each Rank | | | Percent Ranking 1st-3rd | Total Responding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | | |
| 1. To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child | 39 | 12 | 0 | 100 | 51 |
| 2. A desire to explore new teaching techniques | 13 | 21 | 8 | 82 | 51 |
| 3. To gain additional skill in a specific teaching area | 2 | 9 | 25 | 71 | 51 |
| 4. Specialized training in a particular area | 5 | 3 | 11 | 37 | 51 |
| 5. Self-developed competency in a particular area | 0 | 7 | 5 | 24 | 51 |

Table III c.
Round I Post

| Reasons | Teachers Indicating Each Rank | | | Percent Ranking 1st-3rd | Total Responding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | | |
| 1. To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child | 23 | 7 | 0 | 100 | 30 |
| 2. A desire to explore new teaching techniques | 8 | 13 | 5 | 87 | 30 |
| 3. To gain additional skill in a specific teaching area | 2 | 5 | 14 | 70 | 30 |
| 4. Specialized training in a particular area | 3 | 2 | 7 | 40 | 30 |
| 5. Self-developed competency in a particular area | 0 | 5 | 3 | 27 | 30 |

Some of the TIF Winners sought help in preparing their project proposals. Their sources of help are shown in the following table.

Table IV
Sources of Help in Preparing Project Proposals

| Helpers | Number Responding | |
|---|---|---|
| | Round I | Round II |
| No one | 12 | 19 |
| Co-teacher | 11 | 26 |
| Other | 4 | 4 |
| Supervisor | 4 | 0 |
| Subject Specialist | 2 | 1 |
| Principal | 1 | 1 |
| University Personnel | 0 | 0 |
| Total Responding | 34 | 51 |

The length of time teachers took to prepare their proposals is shown in the table below.

Table V
Amount of Time Spent Preparing Proposal

| Time | Teachers Responding | |
|---|---|---|
| | Round I | Round II |
| Less than eight hours | 11 | 11 |
| Eight to sixteen hours | 6 | 20 |
| Seventeen to twenty-four hours | 6 | 6 |
| Twenty-five to forty hours | 5 | 2 |
| Forty or more hours | 6 | 12 |
| Total Responding | 34 | 51 |

The TIF Winners had high expectations that their proposal would win approval as is shown in Table VI.

Table VI
Teachers' Expectations For Proposal Approval

| Degree of Expectation | Number Responding | |
|---|---|---|
| | Round I | Round II |
| Highly probable | 16 | 13 |
| Probable | 10 | 23 |
| Uncertain | 6 | 12 |
| Not probable | 2 | 3 |
| Total Responding | 34 | 51 |

Round I participants indicated, on the post, the length of time needed to get their projects started after funding. The results are shown in the following table.

Table VII
Amount of Time Needed to Get Project Started After Funding

| Amount of Time | Number Responding |
|---|---|
| Less than three days | 0 |
| Four to five days | 2 |
| Two weeks | 2 |
| A month | 6 |
| More than a month | 20 |
| Total Responding | 30 |

Round I participants indicated the reactions of the principals and other school personnel to their projects. The results from the post instrument are shown in the following table.

Table VIII
Reaction of the Principals and Other
School Personnel to the Projects

| Reaction | Number Responding |
|---|---|
| Highly favorable | 15 |
| Favorable | 6 |
| Indifferent | 8 |
| Unfavorable | 1 |
| Total Responding | 30 |

Problems encountered by the teachers were ranked in numerical order, beginning with the problem considered to be the greatest to the one considered to be the least. The overall rankings are shown in Table IX. The breakdown for each group is shown in Tables IX a, IX b and IX c.

Table IX
Problems In Implementation of Projects

| Problems | Rank | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre | | Post |
| | Round I | Round II | Round I |
| Difficulty in ordering materials | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Unavailability of materials | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Difficulty in integrating project into the total school program | 3 | 3.5 | 3 |
| Inadequate physical facility | 4 | 3.5 | 5 |
| Lack of cooperation by parents | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| Student apathy | 6 | 8 | 7 |
| Little or no assistance from resource personnel | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| Lack of cooperation by school staff | 8 | 5 | 9 |
| Other | 9 | 9 | 4 |

Table IX a.
Round I Pre

| Problems | Teachers Indicating Each Rank | | | Percent Ranking 1st-3rd | Total Responding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | | |
| 1. Difficulty in ordering materials | 19 | 9 | 1 | 85 | 34 |
| 2. Unavailability of materials | 8 | 4 | 16 | 82 | 34 |
| 3. Difficulty in integrating project into the total school program | 4 | 15 | 2 | 62 | 34 |
| 4. Inadequate physical facility | 8 | 2 | 8 | 53 | 34 |
| 5. Lack of cooperation by parents | 2 | 2 | 4 | 24 | 34 |
| 6. Student apathy | | 6 | | 18 | 34 |
| 7. Little or no assistance from resource personnel | 2 | 2 | | 12 | 34 |
| 8. Lack of cooperation by school staff | | | 2 | 6 | 34 |

Table IX b.
Round II Pre

| Problems | Teachers Indicating Each Rank | | | Percent Ranking 1st-3rd | Total Responding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | | |
| 1. Unavailability of materials | 31 | 14 | 2 | 92 | 51 |
| 2. Difficulty in ordering materials | 21 | 21 | 6 | 94 | 51 |
| 3. Difficulty in integrating project in the total school program | 14 | 18 | | 63 | 51 |
| 4. Inadequate physical facility | 13 | 13 | 17 | 84 | 51 |
| 5. Lack of cooperation by school staff | 17 | | | 33 | 51 |
| 6. Lack of cooperation by parents | 8 | | 9 | 33 | 51 |
| 7. Little or no assistance from resource personnel | | 9 | 9 | 35 | 51 |
| 8. Student apathy | | 11 | | 22 | 51 |
| 9. Other | 4 | 2 | | 12 | 51 |
| Unable to implement | 2 | | | | |
| Need for additional planning | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Lack of time | 1 | 1 | | | |
| No problem | 2 | | | 4 | 51 |

Table IX c.
Round I Post

| Problems | Teachers Indicating Each Rank | | | Percent Ranking 1st-3rd | Total Responding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | | |
| 1. Difficulty in ordering materials | 9 | 5 | 4 | 60 | 30 |
| 2. Unavailability of materials | 6 | 3 | | 30 | 30 |
| 3. Difficulty in integrating project into the total school program | 3 | 3 | 3 | 30 | 30 |
| 4. Other | 4 | 2 | | 20 | 30 |
| Lack of time | 3 | | | | |
| Class size | | 2 | | | |
| Range of ability | 1 | | | | |
| 5. Inadequate physical facilities | 3 | 2 | | 17 | 30 |
| 6. Little or no assistance from resource personnel | | 1 | 1 | 7 | 30 |
| 7. Student apathy | | 1 | | 3 | 30 |
| 8. Lack of cooperation by parents | | | 1 | 3 | 30 |
| 9. Lack of cooperation by school staff | | | | | 30 |
| No problem | | 4 | | | 30 |

The participants indicated the techniques and procedures they planned to use to obtain their objectives. The techniques and procedures actually used to attain the objectives were indicated by Round I on the post. The responses are shown in Table X.

Table X
Anticipated and Actual Teaching Techniques and Procedures

| Techniques and Procedures | Number Responding | | | Percent of Responses | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre | | Post | Pre | | Post |
| | Round I | Round II | Round I | Round I | Round II | Round I |
| Small group instruction | 9 | 13 | 7 | 26 | 25 | 23 |
| Audio-visual aids | 8 | 10 | 7 | 24 | 20 | 23 |
| Individualize instruction | 7 | 12 | 7 | 21 | 23 | 23 |
| Establishment of learning stations | 4 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 14 |
| Remedial help | 4 | 9 | 3 | 12 | 18 | 10 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 7 |
| Total Responses | 34 | 51 | 30 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Round I and II indicated their expected project outcomes on the pre instrument. The expected outcomes were ranked based on the number of responses each received. The results are shown in Table XI.

Table XI
Participants' Expected Project Outcomes

| Expected Outcomes | Number Responding | | Percent of Responses | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Round I | Round II | Round I | Round II |
| Improve learning | 8 | 12 | 24 | 24 |
| Change attitudes | 8 | 11 | 24 | 22 |
| Improve communication | 7 | 8 | 21 | 16 |
| Organize information | 4 | 4 | 12 | 8 |
| Individualize instruction | 3 | 7 | 9 | 14 |
| Improve discipline | 2 | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| Write curriculum materials | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| Total Responses | 34 | 51 | 100 | 100 |

On the post instrument Round I participants indicated the degree to which learning was improved as a result of the projects. The results of their responses are shown below.

Table XII
The Degree To Which Learning Was Improved

| Degree | Number Responding | Percent of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| Much improvement | 17 | 57 |
| Improved | 12 | 40 |
| Little Improved | 1 | 3 |
| No improvement | | |
| Total Responses | 30 | 100 |

The methods used by Round I participants to measure their project outcomes are shown in Table XIII.

Table XIII
Used To Measure Project Outcomes

| Methods | Number Responding | Percent of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| Student's behavior | 9 | 30 |
| Observation by teachers | 8 | 27 |
| Teacher-made tests | 4 | 13 |
| Standardized tests | 3 | 10 |
| Student's attitude | 3 | 10 |
| Observation by other school personnel | 3 | 10 |
| Total Responses | 30 | 100 |

TABLE XIV

Ratings of Expectations (Round I and II Pre) and (Round I Post)

| Statements | Percent of Responses | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Round I Pre | | | | Round II Pre | | | | Round I Post | | | | |
| | Very Well | Well | Fairly Well | Poor | Very Well | Well | Fairly Well | Poor | Very Well | Well | Fairly Well | Poor | Not at all |
| 1. Help me identify children's needs. | 44 | 50 | 3 | 3 | 61 | 29 | 6 | 4 | 48 | 37 | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| 2. Give clues for understanding children's needs. | 47 | 41 | 12 | 0 | 58 | 34 | 6 | 2 | 44 | 33 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Provide possible solutions to meet children's needs. | 43 | 39 | 18 | 0 | 47 | 37 | 16 | 0 | 37 | 52 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Develop ways of motivating children | 82 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 73 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 61 | 36 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. Provide varied and innovative gimmicks for motivating children. | 59 | 34 | 7 | 0 | 59 | 29 | 12 | 0 | 56 | 37 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Provide innovative teaching techiques in content areas. | 9 | 39 | 39 | 13 | 45 | 35 | 18 | 2 | 59 | 22 | 15 | 0 | 4 |
| 7. Give training in the use of devices to measure growth of children. | 52 | 41 | 7 | 0 | 16 | 47 | 18 | 18 | 22 | 19 | 30 | 11 | 19 |
| 8. Provide training that will lead to change in attitudes. | 52 | 39 | 9 | 0 | 53 | 25 | 18 | 4 | 62 | 27 | 8 | 4 | 0 |
| 9. Make all participants aware of the need for self-evaluation. | 49 | 39 | 12 | 0 | 41 | 37 | 18 | 4 | 27 | 31 | 35 | 4 | 4 |
| 10. Promote better working relationships for entire school staff. | 16 | 23 | 48 | 13 | 25 | 21 | 40 | 15 | 7 | 4 | 30 | 15 | 44 |
| 11. Improve working relationships with parents and other community agencies. | 38 | 21 | 38 | 3 | 20 | 37 | 25 | 18 | 4 | 35 | 38 | 4 | 19 |
| 12. Make school personnel aware of varied school and community resources. | 39 | 27 | 31 | 3 | 29 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 7 | 19 | 26 | 15 | 33 |
| 13. Promote a shairing of ideas, techniques, and physical resources. | 56 | 28 | 13 | 3 | 68 | 20 | 8 | 4 | 50 | 23 | 12 | 15 | 0 |
| 14. Identify varied audio-visual equipment. | 53 | 22 | 19 | 6 | 35 | 27 | 31 | 6 | 44 | 11 | 19 | 11 | 15 |
| 15. Develop skills in the use of new audio-visual equipment. | 48 | 19 | 10 | 23 | 28 | 38 | 18 | 16 | 27 | 27 | 12 | 4 | 31 |
| 16. Instruct use of classroom centers as a laboratory of learning rather than a beautifying fixture in the classroom. | 53 | 25 | 11 | 11 | 47 | 31 | 14 | 8 | 52 | 20 | 8 | 4 | 16 |
| 17. Instruct in the development of reasonable behavioral objectives. | 44 | 44 | 12 | 0 | 45 | 43 | 8 | 4 | 35 | 38 | 15 | 0 | 12 |
| 18. Serve as a motivator for the regular school year program. | 65 | 22 | 13 | 0 | 70 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 63 | 25 | 8 | 4 | 0 |
| Mean | 47 | 31 | 17 | 4 | 46 | 32 | 16 | 6 | 39 | 28 | 17 | 5 | 11 |
| Mean (Well & Very Well) | 78.5 | | | | 77.7 | | | | 66.7 | | | | |

15

Part II of the pre instrument was designed to measure the participants' expectations in a variety of areas. Part II of the post was designed to measure the same areas to see to what degree these expectations were met. Participants rated eighteen statements on a scale ranging from very well to poor. An overall mean was computed for each Round. "Very Well" and "Well" responses were combined and a mean was computed. See Table XIV on the preceding page.

The mean of the combined "very well" and "well" responses is 78.5 and 66.7 on the pre and post respectively for Round I participants, making a difference of 11.9. A t-test was applied to test whether the difference was significant. The obtained t is 2.63 with 17 df, this t is significant at the 5% level. We concluded that the degree of accomplishment in the areas listed in Table XIV was significantly less than the degree of expectations.

The three main reasons for seeking an award (Table III) and the three main expected outcomes (Table XI) lead us to analyze those statements from Table XIV that are applicable. See Table XV.

Table XV
Ratings of Statements Supporting Tables III and XI

| Statements | Percent of Responses | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Round I Pre | | Round I Post | |
| | Very Well | Well | Very Well | Well |
| 1. Help me identify children's needs | 94 | | 85 | |
| 2. Give clues for understanding children's needs | 88 | | 77 | |
| 3. Provide possible solutions to meet children's needs | 82 | | 89 | |
| 4. Develop ways of motivating children | 94 | | 97 | |
| 5. Provide varied and innovative gimmicks for motivating children | 93 | | 93 | |
| 6. Provide innovative teaching techniques in content areas | 48 | | 81 | |
| 7. Provide training that will lead to change in attitudes | 91 | | 89 | |
| Mean | 84.3 | | 87.3 | |

A t-test applied to these means produces a t score of .55. With 6 df a score of 2.4 is needed at the 5% level to be significant. We conclude that there is no significant difference in the degree of expectations and the degree of accomplishments in the areas listed in Table XV.

Both Rounds of participants were asked the following question , "What do you see as a way/ways to make the Teacher Innovation Fund-Pilot Program have more meaning for teachers? (please list.)" Following is a list compiled from the responses of both groups on the pre instrument.

1. Publicize the TIF program through booklets, newspapers, films and other news media.

2. Hold demonstrations and seminars for teachers not involved.

3. Inform and develop enthusiasm among principals and supervisors.

4. Provide more funding for materials.

5. Develop better methods for ordering and receiving materials.

6. Give participants more planning time.

7. Allow more time for ordering materials.

8. Award grants in April or June so plans and materials are ready in September.

9. Provide funds to continue projects.

The remaining results are all from the post instrument and was supplied by thirty Round I participants.

Thirteen of the participants stated that knowledge of innovative practices has impact on the professional growth of non-involved teachers. Eight said it did not have an impact and nine responded "don't know."

Twenty-eight of the participants said that their projects have value to merit repeating. Two gave no response to this item.

Twenty-six of the participants indicated that they would change their projects at least a little while four indicated they would not change their project in any way.

Seventeen of the participants indicated that they could repeat their projects in the same form without funds. Twenty-nine indicated

they could repeat their projects in an adapted form without funds.

On the post instrument Round I participants were asked to rank those techniques and procedures which proved most helpful in implementing their projects. The results are shown in Table XVI.

Table XVI
Techniques and Procedures Which Proved
Most Helpful In Implementation

| Techniques and Procedures | Number Indicating Each Rank | | | Percent Ranking 1st-3rd | Total Responding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | | |
| Individualized instruction | 5 | 3 | 3 | 37 | 30 |
| Small group instruction | 5 | 3 | 2 | 33 | 30 |
| Audio-visual aids | 5 | 2 | 2 | 30 | 30 |
| Field trips | 2 | 3 | | 17 | 30 |
| Learning stations | 3 | | 2 | 17 | 30 |
| Remedial help | | 1 | 3 | 13 | 30 |
| Paperbacks and magazines | 1 | | 1 | 7 | 30 |

Table XVII shows the many ways a volunteer aide would be utilized by each TIF winner.

Table XVII
The Way A Volunteer Aide Would Be Utilized

| Activity | No. of Responses | Percent of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| Supervise small groups and individualized work | 18 | 45 |
| Checking students' work | 5 | 12 |
| Making new creative materials | 3 | 7 |
| Teaching and leading games | 3 | 7 |
| Assist on field trips | 3 | 7 |
| Help maintain records | 2 | 5 |
| Others: | 7 | 17 |
| typing | 1 | |
| dittoing | 1 | |
| operate audio-visual equipment | 1 | |
| filing | 1 | |
| fixing bulletin boards | 1 | |
| locate available resources | 1 | |
| help direct playlets | 1 | |
| Total Responses | 41 | 100 |

In writing a summary report for the TIF Program participants indicated that the elements shown in Table XVIII should be included.

Table XVIII
Elements to be Included in A Summary Report

| Elements | Number Responding | Percent of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| A condensed summary of each individual project | 9 | 30 |
| The evaluation done by the individual teachers | 8 | 27 |
| Use of pictures and slides | 8 | 27 |
| Data collected by the Department of Research and Evaluation | 5 | 16 |
| Total Responses | 30 | 100 |

The participants felt that the following results can be accomplished through publication of a summary report.

Table XIX
Results Accomplished Through
Publication of A Summary Report

| Objectives | Number Responding | Percent of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| Motivation for instituting innovative projects | 8 | 26 |
| Resource for new teachers | 6 | 20 |
| Community public relations resource | 6 | 20 |
| Increased interest by participating teachers | 5 | 17 |
| Interest by non-participating teachers | 5 | 17 |
| Total Responses | 30 | 100 |

The participants indicated the degree to which they received help in implementing their project. The results are shown in the following table.

Table XX
The Degree To Which Help Was Received

| Source | Number Responding | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Much | Little | Not At All | |
| Group meetings involving all grant winners | 25 | 5 | | 30 |
| Assistance from the Office of Staff Development | 22 | 7 | 1 | 30 |
| Support from your principal | 12 | 16 | 2 | 30 |
| Support from other school staff | 9 | 11 | 10 | 30 |
| A substitute teacher for half a day | 15 | 4 | 11 | 30 |
| Assistance from the Department of Research and Evaluation | 8 | 7 | 15 | 30 |

The participants were asked to indicate which form of communication between the Office of Staff Development and participating teachers appeared to be more effective by ranking them from most to least. The results are shown on the next page.

Table XXI
Forms of Communication Between The Office of Staff Development and TIF Winners Ranked According To Effectiveness

| Forms of Communication | Number Indicating Each Rank | | | Percent Ranking 1st-3rd | Total Responding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | | |
| 1. Classroom visits by staff of Office of Staff Development | 10 | 4 | 5 | 63 | 30 |
| 2. Talking to teachers | 6 | 7 | 2 | 50 | 30 |
| 3. Meetings | 5 | 2 | 6 | 43 | 30 |
| 4. Reading the notices that appear in your mailbox | 4 | 3 | 1 | 27 | 30 |
| 5. Staff development bulletins | | 5 | 5 | 33 | 30 |
| 6. The principal | 1 | 2 | | 10 | 30 |
| 7. Notices displayed on bulletin boards | 1 | | 1 | 7 | 30 |
| 8. Reading the "Grapevine" | | | 3 | 10 | 30 |
| 9. City newspaper | | 1 | | 3 | 30 |

Table XXII shows the participants preferences for the format of the composite evaluation.

Table XXII
Format For The Composite Evaluation

| Format | Number Indicating Each Rank | | | Percent Ranking 1st-3rd | Total Responding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | | |
| Film | 7 | 6 | 2 | 50 | 30 |
| Pamphlet | 6 | 4 | 7 | 57 | 30 |
| Book | 5 | 4 | 4 | 43 | 30 |
| Filmstrip | 2 | 4 | 8 | 47 | 30 |
| Brochure | 2 | 3 | 5 | 33 | 30 |
| Record | 1 | 1 | 6 | 27 | 30 |

## DISCUSSION

The Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program did seek out and fund innovative classroom projects that were designed by teachers. Funded teachers taught at the elementary, junior high and senior high school levels. As a group these teachers averaged more than five years teaching experience.

The majority of the teachers indicated that they found out about the program from their principals. This seems to indicate acceptance of the program and a willingness by the principals for their teachers to be involved.

The three main reasons given for seeking awards were; (1) To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child; (2) A desire to explore new teaching techniques and; (3) To gain additional skill in a specific teaching area.

In writing their project proposals most of the teachers seeking help received this help from a co-teacher. This shows the involvement and cooperation by other staff from the outset of the project. Seventy percent of the teachers who were awarded thought it at least probable that their proposal would win approval. This indicates the confidence the teachers had in their project.

Twenty of the thirty teachers responding on the post instrument indicated that it took more than a month to get their project started after funding. They indicated that the three main problems encountered were; (1) difficulty in ordering materials; (2) unavailability of materials and; (3) difficulty in integrating the project into the total school program. These teachers listed these same problems in the same order on their pre instrument. In an interview with the program coordinator it was learned that some of the teachers in Round I purchased some materials with their own money and were later reimbursed. Others purchased on credit and presented the bills to the finance office for payment. Some orders were placed directly with the central school supply office.

To alleviate the problems of materials a different procedure was followed for Round II participants. They submitted their requests for supplies to the Office of Staff Development. The Office of Staff Development submitted the orders to the supply office. This procedure did not eliminate the problems surrounding materials. Round II participants cited the same three problems as the main ones encountered. The only change was that "unavailability of materials" was ranked first, followed by "difficulty in ordering materials."

The participants planned to utilize small group instruction, individualized instruction, and audio-visual aids as their main techniques and procedure. It was indicated on the post that these three techniques proved to be the most helpful in implementing the projects.

The teachers expected improved learning, changedattitudes, and improved communications to be the major outcomes of their projects. Twenty-nine of the thirty teachers responding on the post instrument indicated that learning was improved. One indicated that learning was a little improved. The three main methods used to measure the outcomes were; (1) student behavior; (2) observation by teachers and; (3) teacher-made test.

In rating a long list of expectations (see Table XIV) 78.5 and 77.7 percent of Round I and Round II's responses respectively indicated that these expectations would be met "well" or "very well". At the end of the project 66.7 percent of Round I's responses indicated these expectations were actually met "well" or "very well". A t test was applied to test for significant difference between the pre and post responses of Round I participants. A t score of 2.6 indicated a significant difference at the 5% level of confidence. We can assert with confidence that there was a significant difference between the responses of Round I participants before and after. All of the expectations were not met as well as the participants predicted they would be met. However, all of the expectations on the list were not included in the TIF winners reasons for seeking an award, or in their expected outcomes as shown in Tables III and XI respectively. In an analysis of those expectations supporting the three main reasons for seeking an award and the three main expected outcomes (see Table XV) 84.3 percent and 87.3 percent of the responses of Round I participants on the pre and post respectively were "well" or "very well". A t test was applied. The difference between the pre and post responses was not significant. The participants felt quite sure these expectations would be met and indicated to the same degree that they were met.

Twenty-eight of the thirty responding to the post instrument felt that their project had enough value to merit repeating. Twenty-six indicated that they would change their projects a little in carrying it out again. Seventeen felt that they could repeat their projects without additional funds. Twenty-nine felt they could repeat their project in an adapted form without funds.

The majority of the teachers would use an aide, if one was available for three hours a day, to supervise small groups and individualized work.

The three sources of most help to the teachers were; (1) group meetings involving all grant winners; (2) assistance from the Office of Staff Development and support from the principal. Classroom visits by members of the Office of Staff Development was rated as the best form of communication between TIF Winners and the Office of Staff Development followed by talking with other teachers and meetings.

Participants' responses concerning a summary report for the TIF program, along with their suggestions of ways to make the program more meaningful for teachers lead to a series of outcomes. First, many evaluation meetings were held; color slides, video tapes and pictures were shared by participants in "Show and Tell" sessions. Second, reports on innovative projects were assembled. Third and probably the most important outcome was

the approval of a proposal submitted by the Office of Staff Development to the Department of Federal Programs which led to the establishment of the Innovative Methods Processing Center (IMP).

The IMP Center is a resource bank and talent pool for the diffusion of effective programs. A complete description of each TIF project is on file at the center. These innovative ideas are disseminated to other teachers from the center.

A book entitled "A Guide To Innovative Projects" was published and distributed by the center. The book contains resumes of process summaries of each TIF project. When other teachers visit the IMP Center, located at Dunbar High School, they can see a slide show of the TIF awards winners carrying out their innovative programs. They can learn about the materials and equipment needed for innovative techniques. Six TIF winners are repeating their projects this year. These six teachers were refunded for the purpose of keeping their classrooms open to visitors who want to see a TIF program in action. In addition thirty of the TIF Winners volunteered to be "open line" teachers. They are available for advice and consultation for new teachers implementing innovative projects.

As a result of all these varied activities many teachers are trying innovative projects without the benefit of awards.

## CONCLUSIONS

In analysis of the data on the Teachers Innovative Fund program seems to warrant the following conclusions:

1. Teachers were given the opportunity to make their own special idea come true in their classroom.

2. Many different innovative programs resulted.

3. Learning was improved and made more exciting.

4. Motivation was increased among teachers and children involved in the projects.
5. New teaching techniques for individualizing instruction were developed and tried.
6. Attitudes towards learning were changed.

7. New and additional teaching materials were acquired.

8. New ideas and techniques were publicized for use by non involved teachers through demonstrations, books and seminars.
9. Incentives were given for others to try innovative projects.

10. Expertise was developed and used to help others.

11. Abilities and skills needed to compile and disseminate materials and ideas were acquired by the TIF winners.

12. A resource bank and talent pool was established.

A typical testimonial of the TIF winners made by one participant states: "It's been a great, out-of-the-rut year... to be able at last to really look at my kids, try out my own ideas. And look at the parents' response - they're right with us. Being a part of the TIF program has made me, as a teacher feel important too".

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Schedule the awarding of grants by the end of the school year for the succeeding school year.

2. Develop a better procedure for ordering and receiving materials.

3. Schedule regular visits to each project by Staff of Office of Staff Development.

4. Give special attention to the flexibility of the school's program in considering an innovative project.

5. Physical facilities should be considered when deciding on an innovative project.

Appendix A
Pre Questionnaire

Dear Participant:

The Staff Development Office is interested in finding out how you feel about the individual project you have selected for experimentation in your classroom. Thus, we are asking that you respond to a few statements.

Name _____

Grade/Subject _____

Number of Years you have taught _____

1. How did you find out about the existence of the Teacher Innovation Grants?

   _____ Central school office _____ Principal _____ Supervisor

   _____ Teacher _____ Other (please specify)

2. For what reasons did you seek an award? (Please rank from most to least.)

   _____ Specialized training in a particular area

   _____ Self-developed competency in a particular area

   _____ a desire to explore new teaching techniques

   _____ to gain additional skill in a specific teaching area

   _____ to provide an additional and/or enriching experience for the child

   _____ Other

3. Who aided you in preparing your proposal?

   _____ University personnel _____ Subject Specialist _____ Supervisor

   _____ Principal _____ Co-Teacher _____ No one _____ Other (Please specify)

4. How long did it take you to prepare your proposal?

   _____ less than eight hours

   _____ eight to sixteen hours

   _____ seventeen to twenty-four hours

   _____ twenty-five to forty hours

   _____ forty or more

5. To what degree did you expect your proposal to win approval?

   _____ highly probable

   _____ probable

   _____ uncertain

   _____ not probable

6. What problems did you encounter in the initial implementation of the program? (Please rank from greatest to least)

_____ lack of cooperation by school staff

_____ student apathy

_____ unavailability of materials

_____ inadequate physical facility

_____ difficulty in integrating project in the total school program

_____ lack of cooperation by parents

_____ little or no assistance from resource personnel

_____ difficulty in ordering materials

_____ other

7. How much time did it take you to get your program with the students started?

_____ less than one day

_____ one to two days

_____ three to four days

_____ five to six days

_____ seven days or more

8. What techniques and procedures will you use to obtain your objectives?

_____ individualize instruction

_____ small group instruction

_____ remedial help

_____ audio-visual aides

_____ establishment of learning stations

_____ other (please specify)

9. What are your expected outcomes?

_____ improve learning

_____ individualize instruction

_____ improve communication

_____ organize information

9. What are your expected outcomes? (continued)

_____ improve discipline

_____ change attitudes

_____ write curriculum materials

10. What do you see as a way/ways to make the Teacher Innovation Fund-Pilot Program have more meaning for teachers? (please list)

## Part II

Before implementing the project you chose, you must have had some idea as to how the project would develop. You probably asked, how will this project help me in working with children. Listed below are a number of statements regarding possible expectations by teachers. Therefore, we are asking that you rate the following statements using very well, well, fairly well, or poor.

The project will:

1. Help me identify children's needs.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

2. Give clues for understanding children's needs.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

3. Provide possible solutions to meet children's needs.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

4. Develop ways of motivating children.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

5. Provide varied and innovative gimmicks for motivating children.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

6. Provide innovative teaching techniques in content areas.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

7. Give training in the use of devices used to measure growth of children.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

8. Provide training that will lead to a change in attitudes.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

9. Make all participants aware of the need for self-evaluation.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

10. Promote better working relationships for entire school staff.

    _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

11. Improve working relationships with parents and other community agencies.

    _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

12. Make school personnel aware of varied school and community resources.

    _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

13. Promote a sharing of ideas, techniques, and physical resources.

_____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

14. Identify varied audio-visual equipment.

_____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

15. Develop skills in the use of new audio-visual equipment.

_____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

16. Instruct use of classroom centers as a laboratory of learning rather than a beautifying fixture in the classroom.

_____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

17. Instruct in the development of reasonable behavioral objectives.

_____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

18. Serve as a motivator for the regular school year program.

_____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor

Prepared by
Department of Research and Evaluation
March 17, 1970

## Appendix B
## Post Questionnaire

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND
Post-Evaluation Instrument

Dear Participant:

The Staff Development Office is interested in finding out how you feel about the individual project you have used for experimentation in your classroom. Thus, we are asking that you respond to a few statements.

Name _____

Grade/Subject _____

Number of Years you have taught _____

1. What benefits have you received as a result of being awarded a grant. (Please rank from most to least.)
   _____ Specialized training in a particular area
   _____ Self-developed competency in a particular area
   _____ Freedom to explore new teaching techniques
   _____ The gain of additional skill in a specific teaching area
   _____ Provision for additional and/or enriching experiences for the child
   _____ None
   _____ Other (Please specify)

2. Who aided you in implementing your proposal?
   _____ University personnel _____ Subject Specialist
   _____ Supervisor _____ Principal _____ Co-Teacher
   _____ No one _____ Other (Please specify)

3. After having received grant approval, how long did it take you to get your program /project started?
   _____ less than three days
   _____ four to five days
   _____ two weeks
   _____ a month
   _____ more than a month

4. What was the reaction of the principal and other school personnel regarding your program/project?
   _____ highly favorable
   _____ favorable
   _____ indifferent
   _____ unfavorable
   _____ extremely critical

5. What problems did you encounter in the implementation of the program? (Please rank from greatest to least)
   _____ lack of cooperation by school staff
   _____ student apathy
   _____ unavailability of materials
   _____ inadequate physical facility
   _____ difficulty in integrating project in the total school program
   _____ lack of cooperation by parents
   _____ little or no assistance from resource personnel
   _____ difficulty in ordering materials
   _____ other

42

6. What techniques and procedures did you use to obtain your objectives?

_____ individualized instruction
_____ small group instruction
_____ remedial help
_____ audio-visual aides
_____ establishment of learning stations
_____ other (Please specify)

7. Which of the above techniques and procedures proved most helpful in implementing your program? (see question 6)

_____

8. To what degree was learning improved as a result of implementation of your program/project?

_____ much improved
_____ improved
_____ little improvement
_____ no improvement

9. How did you measure your outcomes?

_____ standardized tests
_____ teacher-made tests
_____ observation by teachers
_____ observation by other school personnel
_____ student's behavior
_____ other (specify)

10. Does knowledge of innovative practices of teachers have any impact on the professional growth of non-involved teachers?

_____ yes _____ no _____ do not know

If yes, please specify how _____

_____

_____

11. Does the project have enough value for students to merit repetition? _____

_____

_____

12. Would you change the project in any way? _____a lot ___a little _____not at all

13. Can you repeat it without funds?
In the same form. yes____ no _____
In an adapted form. yes____ no ____

14. If you had a volunteer aide for three hours a week what way would you use him? Please list.

15. What elements should the Office of Staff Development include when writing a summary report for the TIF program?

_____ the evaluations done by the individual teachers
_____ use of pictures and slides
_____ the results of the data collected by the Dept. of Research and Evaluation
_____ a condensed summary of each individual project
_____ other (Please specify)

16. The following can be accomplished through the publicizing of a summary report:

_____ increased interest by participating teachers
_____ interest by non-participating teachers
_____ resource for new teachers
_____ motivator for instituting innovative programs and projects
_____ community public relations resource
_____ other (please specify)

17. To what degree have the following helped you implement your program/project"

| | Much | Little | Not at all |
|---|---|---|---|
| _____ a substitute teacher for a half day | | | |
| _____ assistance from the Office of Staff Development | | | |
| _____ assistance from the Department of Research and Evaluation | | | |
| _____ group meetings involving all grant winners | | | |
| _____ support from your principal | | | |
| _____ support from other school staff | | | |

18. Which form of communication between the Staff Development Office and teachers appears to be effective? (Please rank from most to least)

_____ talking to teachers
_____ reading the "Grapevine"
_____ reading the notices that appear in your mailbox
_____ notices displayed on bulletin boards
_____ the principal
_____ city newspaper
_____ meetings
_____ staff-development bulletins
_____ classroom visit by staff of Office of Staff Development
_____ other (please specify)

19. What format do you think the composite evaluation should take?

_____ book
_____ film
_____ pamphlet
_____ prochure
_____ film strip
_____ record
_____ other (Please specify)

20. Now that you have had time for your project, what do you see as a way/ways to make the Teacher Innovation Fund-Pilot Proggram have more meaning for teachers? (Please list)

Part II

Before implementing the project you chose, you must have had some idea as to how the project would develop. You probably asked, how will this project help me in working with children. Listed below are a number of statements regarding possible expectations by teachers. On a previous occasion you responded to these questions, may we have your response again. Therefore, we are asking that you rate the following statements using very well, well, fairly well, poor, or not at all.

The project:

1. Helped me identify children's needs.
   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____poor __not at all

2. Gave clues for understanding children's needs.
   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____poor __not at all

3. Provided possible solutions to meet children's needs.
   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____poor __not at all

4. Developed ways of motivating children.
   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____poor__not at all

5. Provided varied and innovative gimmicks for motivating children.
   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor __not at all

6. Provided innovative teaching techniques in content areas.
   _____ Very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor __not at all

7. Gave training in the use of devices used to measure growth of children.
   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor __not at all

8. Provided training that led to a change in attitudes.
   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor __not at all

9. Made all participants aware of the need for self-evaluation.
   _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor __not at all

10. Promoted better working relationships for entire school staff.
    _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor __not at all

11. Improved working relationships with parents and other community agencies.
    _____ Very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor __not at all

12. Made school personnel aware of varied school and community resources.
    _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor __not at all

13. Promoted a sharing of ideas, techniques, and physical resources.
    _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor __not at all

14. Identified varied audio-visual equipment.
    _____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor __not at all

15. Developed skills in the use of new audio-visual equipment.
_____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor _____ not at all

16. Helped teachers use classroom centers as a laboratory of learning rather than a beautifying fixture in the classroom.
_____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor _____ not at all

17. Helped teachers develop reasonable behavioral objectives.
_____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor _____ not at all

18. Served as a motivator for the regular school year program.
_____ very well _____ well _____ fairly well _____ poor _____ not at all

Prepared by
Department of Research and Evaluation
May 26, 1970

## Appendix C
## Round I Participants, Schools, Project Titles and Grade Levels

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND GROUP I. 1968-69

| Name | School | Phone | Grade | Title of Project | Code |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bolling, Sonja | Truesdell<br>125 V St., N.W. | 629-2427<br>483-7162 | Kgn. | Phonovisual Prog. | 0110 |
| Boylan, Mary N. | Barnard<br>7333 New Hampshire Ave.<br>West Hyattsville, Md. | 629-2608<br>439-9696 | 3 | Oral and Written English | 0108 |
| Bradford, Grace | Woodson<br>641 Ingraham St., N.W. | 629-3193<br>TU2-5137 | Jr. High Music | Recorder Consort | 0741 |
| Brock, Frances | Macfarland<br>318 Webster St., N.W. | 629-2600<br>829-6943 | 7-8 | Time Space and Matter | 0461 |
| Brussat, Mona | Hearst | 629-2628 | 4-6 | Classroom in Museum | 0305 |
| Bushlow, Patricia | Eaton | 629-2612 | Spec. Ed. | Special Education | 0306 |
| Clark, Mildred | Truesdell<br>4227 Blagden Ave., NW | 629-2427<br>291-6708 | 4 | Individual Instruction in Reading | 0109 |
| Collins, Nancy | Benning<br>4427 C St., S.E. | 629-2470<br>581-5299 | 3-4 | Reading is Thinking | 0106 |
| Davis, Ruth | Lafayette<br>3009 Daniel La., NW | 629-2632<br>362-8507 | Kgn.-6 | Music and Monotones | 0746 |
| Derricotte, Marcia | Macfarland<br>1001 Spring St.,<br>Silver Spring, Md. | 629-2600<br>585-6982 | Jr. High English | Lang. Arts, List., Sp., Read. & Writing | 0111 |

| Name | School | Phone | Grade | Title of Project | Code |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Desan, Elizabeth | ~~Fillmore-Hyde~~ Brimke<br>1620 29th St., N.W. | 629-~~2545~~<br>462-2981 | 1-6 | Remedial Reading | 0116 |
| Dodge, Edna K. | Hearst | 629-2628 | 4-6 | Classroom Museum | 0305 |
| Edmonds, Earline | Kenilworth<br>3900 14th St., N.W. | 629-2621<br>829-0533 | 1st | Tri-Media | 0103 |
| Ferman, Bertha P. | Hearst | 629-2628 | 4-6 | Classroom Museum | 0305 |
| Fisher, Belford | Truesdell<br>1813 Franklin St., NE | 629-2427<br>832-3615 | Remedial Read. & Arithm. | Leaders of Tomorrow | 0901 |
| Fletcher, Jennie | Clark<br>5117 N. Capitol | 629-2769<br>526-9016 | Kgn. | Listening Skills | 0112 |
| Gibson, Gloria | Truesdell<br>1605 Kennedy Pl., NW | 629-2427<br>723-1732 | Kgn.-6 | Individualized Phonovisual Prog. | 0110 |
| Glaser, Rose L. | Deal<br>1916 Spruce Dr., NW | 629-2629<br>726-8850 | Jr. High History & English | English & History | 0121 |
| Hatkin, Gertrude | Janney<br>5614 Oak Place,<br>Bethesda, Md. | 629-2490<br>530-3673 | 5 | Life in the U.S. | 0303 |
| Jackson, Mary A. | Oyster<br>5322 5th St., N.W. | 629-2451<br>TA9-9048 | 6 | Creative Writing | 0120 |
| Mitchell, Cynthia | Woodson<br>2029 Trumbull Ter. NW | 629-3193<br>723-0281 | Jr. High Music | Kodaly - Richards Method | 0743 |
| Mitchell, Pauline | Kelly Miller<br>1001 3rd St., S.W. | 629-4771<br>638-2573 | Jr. High Com. Lab. | Communication Lab. | 0105 |

| Name | School | Phone | Grade | Title of Project | Code |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Muckleroy, Johnetta | Jackson<br>3435 Yuma St., N.W. | 629-2437<br>362-7647 | 5-6 | Drawing Movies | 0701 |
| Nusenko, Gail | Horace Mann<br>6822 Kenyon Dr.,<br>Alex., Va. | 629-2631<br>765-7561 | S.M.R. | Absorption | 0123 SMR |
| Parker, Marie S. | Hyde | 629-2519 | 4 | Reading | 0115 |
| Phillips, Barbara | Janney<br>3909 McKinley St., NW | 629-2490<br>244-6682 | 5 | Life in the U.S. | 0303 |
| Reed, Daisy | Truesdell<br>2611 33rd St., S.E. | 629-2427<br>582-1558 | 4 | Individual Instruction in Reading | 0109 |
| Robinson, Ethel D. | Kenilworth<br>2200 Upshur St., N.E. | 629-2621<br>529-7436 | 2<br>N.G. | Tri-Media | 0103 |
| Rogers, Margaret | Kenilworth<br>4721 Texas Ave., S.E. | 629-2621<br>581-4429 | 2<br>N.G. | Tri-Media | 0103 |
| Sargent, Mary E. | Eaton<br>3925 Chesterbrook Rd.<br>Arlington, Va. | 629-2612<br>536-5734 | Kgn.-6 | Music Resource Center | 0745 |
| Sheridan, Kathleen | Stoddert | 629-2637 | Kgn.-6 | Creative Dramatics | 0122 |
| Skartvedt, May O. | Murch<br>4400 East West Hwy.<br>Bethesda, Md. | 629-2613<br>654-1165 | Kgn.-6 | Improved Library Service | 0114 |
| Snow, Roberta | Hyde<br>1327 35th St., | 629-2519<br>965-9315 | 5-6 | Insects | 0463 |
| Utsey, Glenda | Hearst<br>2939 Van Ness St., NW | 629-2628<br>362-2982 | 4-6 | Literature in Fourth Grade | 0119 |

| Name | School | Phone | Grade | Title of Project | Code |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vaughn, Jean | West<br>P.O. Box 2456 | 629-2535<br>882-7396 | 3 | Our City | 0302 |
| Washington, Jonelle | Macfarland<br>116 Longfellow St., NW | 629-2600<br>TU2-5948 | Jr. High Math. | Mathematics | 0402 |
| Williams, Carolyn | Benning<br>4744 Benning Rd., S.E. | 629-2470<br>581-8781 | Nongraded Primary | Sixth Grade | 0107 |
| Williams, Thelma | Kenilworth<br>4740 Benning Rd., S. E. | 629-2612<br>583-0560 | Nongraded 2 | Tri-Media | 0103 |
| Wilson, Jacqueline | Benning<br>326 Taylor St., N.W. | 629-2470<br>726-4419 | 4 | Reading is Thinking | 0106 |

52

## Appendix D
## Round II Participants, Schools
## Project Titles and Grade Levels

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND: GROUP II, 1969–70

| TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS | SCHOOL | PROJECT TITLE | GRADE LEVEL | PROJECT TEAM or INDIVIDUAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mrs. Anyce Arrington<br>2330 Good Hope Road, S. E.<br>Apt. 304, Washington, D.C. 20020 | SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH | "COMPUTATIONAL CENTERS FOR INDIVIDUAL AND SELF–HELP IMPROVEMENT" | 7–9 | T–1 (4) |
| Mrs. J. A. Ball<br>301–50th St. S.E. Apt. 3<br>Washington, D.C. 20019 | ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH | "TOTAL INVOLVEMENT IN WOMANHOOD" | 7–9 | T–2(4) |
| Mrs. Otelia E. Barnwell<br>9313 Pella Place<br>Clinton, Maryland 20735 | MINER ELEMENTARY | "ACTION AND INTERACTION" | 1 | X |
| Barbara P. Beam<br>2932 Vista St., N.E.<br>Washington, D.C. 20018 | MINER ELEMENTARY | "PUPIL SELF–HELP PROJECTS" | 3 | X |
| Mr. Ronald A. Berk<br>11900 Indigo Road<br>Silver Spring, Md. 20906 | THOMAS ELEMENTARY | "UNITED STATES–AFRO-AMERICAN HISTORY" | 5 | X |
| Mrs. Ann Shaum Brown<br>1354 South 28th Street<br>Arlington, Va. 22206 | BUCHANAN ELEMENTARY | "ME, I AM AN IMPORTANT PERSON" | Non-Graded | X |
| Miss B.A. Campbell<br>2474 Alabama Avenue, S.E.<br>Apt. 103, Washington, D.C. 20020 | PAYNE ELEMENTARY | "THE PAYNE SCHOOL MATH CLUB" | K–6 | T–3 (4) |
| Mrs. B.H. Christopher<br>1840 Shepherd St., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C. 20019 | ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH | "TOTAL INVOLVEMENT IN WOMANHOOD" | 7–9 | T–2 (4) |
| Miss Teresa Covacevich<br>2032 Belmont Road<br>Washington, D.C. 20009 | EASTERN HIGH | "A LITERARY-ARTS MAGAZINE FOR EASTERN" | High School | T–4 (2) |
| Mr. James V. Crivella<br>1210 Perry St., N.E.<br>Apt.34, Washington, D.C. 20017 | SPINGARN HIGH | "CREATIVE DRAMATICS" | 10–12 | X |
| Mrs. Viola R. Egypt<br>3960 Suitland Rd., Apt. 203<br>Suitland, Md. 20023 | SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH | "COMPUTATIONAL CENTERS FOR INDIVIDUAL | 7–9 | T–1 (4) |
| Mrs. M.S. Ensminger<br>1511–22nd St., N.W.<br>Washington, D.C. 20037 | ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH | "TOTAL INVOLVEMENT IN WOMANHOOD" | 7–9 | T–2 (4) |

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND: GROUP II, 1969–70

| TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS | SCHOOL | PROJECT TITLE | GRADE LEVEL | PROJECT TEAM or INDIVIDUAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gloria N. Ford<br>1358 Tuckerman St.,N.W.<br>Washington, D. C. 20011 | MINER ELEMENTARY | "A PREVENTIVE APPROACH TO READING PROBLEMS" | Elem. | X |
| Mrs. Edna F. Frye<br>4213 Kinmount Raod<br>Lanham, Md. 20801 | MAURY ELEMENTARY | PROJECT "WHAT" "WE HELP AND TEACH" PARENTS HELP AND LEARN WHAT IS GOING ON AND WHAT TO DO. | 1 | X |
| Mr. Julius E. Glover, Jr.<br>1649 Crittenden St.,N.E.<br>Washington, D.C. 20017 | SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH | "BASIC PHOTOGRAPHY" | 7–9 | T–5 (2) |
| Mr. Thomas Gomillion<br>1454 Irving St., N.W. Apt. 304<br>Washington, D.C. 20010 | DAVIS ELEMENTARY | "PERCEPTUAL MOTOR DEVELOPMENT – STUDENT INVOLVEMENT" | 2 | X |
| Mr Pinkney C. Hatton<br>1412 F Street, N E.<br>Washington, D.C. 20002 | ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH | "PROGRAMMED INSTRUCTION IN MATHEMATICS" | 7 | T–6 (2) |
| Phyllis D. Hines<br>7610 F St., N.E Apt. 202<br>Washington, D. C. 20027 | GIBBS ELEMENTARY | "PROJECT SEE HEAR SAY" | Kgn. | X |
| Mrs. Vera G. Hunter<br>5511 First Street, N. E.<br>Washington, D. C. 20011 | VAN NESS ELEMENTARY | "FACES IN THE NEWS THROUGH THE USE OF SLIDES" | 1–6 | X |
| Norma B. Jackson<br>4237 Benning Road, N.E.<br>Washington, D.C. 20019 | THOMAS ELEMENTARY | "MEETING ETHNIC GROUPS THROUGH THEIR FOLKLORE AND CUSTOMS" | 5 & 6 | X |
| Anna Paige Johnson<br>905 E. Meadows Court<br>Oxon Hill, Md. 20021 | PLUMMER ELEMENTARY | "LISTENING STATIONS" | Kgn. | X |
| Mr. Donald B. Juncal<br>8710 Rosedale Lane<br>Annandale, Virginia 22003 | PHELPS VOCATIONAL HIGH | "VISUAL AIDS FOR THE LANDSCAPE COURSE" | 10–12 | T–7 (3) |
| Mr. Roscoe C. Lewis<br>100 Nicholson St., N.W.<br>Washington, D.C. 20011 | PHELPS VOCATIONAL HIGH | "VISUAL AIDS FOR THE LANDSCAPE COURSE" | 10–12 | T–7 (3) |
| Mrs. Mary Etta Love<br>4204–18th Street N.W.<br>Washington, D.C. 20011 | SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH | "COMPUTATIONAL CENTERS FOR INDIVIDUAL and SELF–HELP IMPROVEMENT" | 7–9 | T–1 (4) |
| Mr. Robert McFadden<br>3900 14th St. N. W.<br>Washington, D. C. 20011 | SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH | "PERSONAL AND FAMILY LIVING BOOK AND FILM CLUB" | Jr.High | T–9(3) |

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND: GROUP II, 1969–70

| TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS | SCHOOL | PROJECT TITLE | GRADE LEVEL | PROJECT TEAM or INDIVIDUAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mrs. Lottie W. Medley<br>3122 32nd St., S.E.<br>Washington, D.C. 20020 | KIMBALL ELEMENTARY | "PEAK – PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AT KIMBALL" | 6 | T–8 (6) |
| Mrs. Betty Jean Mikesell<br>8107 Garland Avenue<br>Takoma Park, Md. 20012 | ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH | "PROGRAMMED INSTRUCTION IN MATHEMATICS" | 7 | T–6 (2) |
| Mrs. Janice G. Morman<br>7259 Cross Street<br>Forestville, Md. 20028 | KIMBALL ELEMENTARY | "PEAK – PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AT KIMBALL" | 6 | T–8 (6) |
| Mrs. M.W. Myers<br>1714–62nd Avenue<br>Cheverly, Md. 20785 | RANDALL JUNIOR HIGH | "READING SEMINAR" | Jr. High | X |
| Mrs. Levon S. Norwood<br>4727 Bromley Avenue<br>Suitland, Md. 20023 | SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH | "COMPUTATIONAL CENTER FOR INDIVIDUAL AND SELF–HELP IMPROVEMENT" | 7–9 | T–1 (4) |
| Miss Monica O'Connell<br>1218 Perry St., N.E. Apt. 11<br>Washington, D. C. 20017 | SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH | "PERSONAL AND FAMILY LIVING BOOK AND FILM CLUB" | Jr.High | T–9 (3) |
| Mr. Guy A. Pandolfino<br>113 Pitt Lane<br>Forest Heights, Md. 20021 | PHELPS VOCATIONAL HIGH | "ORTHOPEDIC SHOE REPAIR" | 10–12 | X |
| Donna M. Parker<br>8518 Allendale Road<br>Hyattsville, Md. 20785 | EASTERN HIGH | "MEDIA PACKET" | 10 | X |
| Mrs. S. H. Patrick<br>2619 Naylor Rd.,S.E. Apt. 101<br>Washington, D. C. 20020 | PAYNE ELEMENTARY | "THE PAYNE SCHOOL MATH CLUB" | K–6 | T–3 (4) |
| Miss Novella E. Phifer<br>112 Galveston St., S. W.<br>Washington, D. C. 20032 | KIMBALL ELEMENTARY | "PEAK – PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL | 6 | T–8 (6) |
| Mr. R.G. Phillips<br>2110 N. Monroe Street<br>Arlington, Virginia 22207 | PAYNE ELEMENTARY | "THE PAYNE SCHOOL MATH CLUB" | K–6 | T–3 (4) |
| Dorothea A. Preis<br>622 N. Carolina Ave., S.E.<br>Washington, D.C. 20003 | PAYNE ELEMENTARY | "PHOTO–BOOKS" | 2 | X |
| Mrs. Velma S. Prince<br>5574 B. Street, S.E. Apt. 104<br>Washington, D. C. 20019 | YOUNG ELEMENTARY | "INDIVIDUALIZING PHONETIC SKILLS TO SUPPLEMENT BASIC TEXTBOOK PROGRAM" | 1 | X |

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND: GROUP II, 1969–70

| TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS | SCHOOL | PROJECT TITLE | GRADE LEVEL | PROJECT TEAM or INDIVIDUAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mrs. Janie B. Prue<br>1311 Kearny St., N.E.<br>Washington, D.C. 20017 | MINER ELEMENTARY | "BRIDGING THE LEARNING GAP IN READING" | 4 | X |
| Mrs. Lela G. Robinson<br>4269–6th Street, S.E.<br>Washington, D. C. 20032 | KIMBALL ELEMENTARY | "PEAK – PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AT KIMBALL" | 6 | T–8 (6) |
| Mrs. Ruth P. Siegel<br>3911 N. Upland Street<br>Arlington, Va. 22207 | SPINGARN HIGH | "ARTS & CRAFTS OF AFRICA & THEIR APPLICATION TODAY" | 10–12 | X |
| Miss Patricia N. Simon<br>3212 W Street, S. E.<br>Washington, D.C. 20020 | KIMBALL ELEMENTARY | "PEAK – PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AT KIMBALL" | 6 | T–8 (6) |
| Mrs. G. Smith<br>2634 Bowen Rd., S.E. Apt. 304<br>Washington, D. C. 20020 | PAYNE ELEMENTARY | "THE PAYNE SCHOOL MATH CLUB" | K–6 | T–3 (4) |
| Mr. James Smith<br>5031 First St., N. W. Apt. 304<br>Washington, D.C. 20011 | SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH | "BASIC PHOTOGRAPHY" | 7–9 | T–5 (2) |
| Mr. James Smith<br>5031–First St.,N.W. Apt. 304<br>Washington, D. C. 20011 | SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH | "SOME BIO–CHEMICAL LABORATORY TECHNIQUES" | Jr. High | T–10 (2) |
| Mr. Truman B. Smith<br>1922 Lakewood Street<br>Suitland, Md. 20023 | SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH | "SOME BIO–CHEMICAL LABORATORY TECHNIQUES" | Jr. High | T–10 (2) |
| Mrs. Margaret B. Southall<br>4407 Edson Place, N. E.<br>Washington, D. C. 20019 | ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH | "TOTAL INVOLVEMENT IN WOMANHOOD" | 7–9 | T–2 (4) |
| S. B. Speier<br>1062–30th Street, N. W.<br>Washington, D. C. 20007 | PHELPS VOCATIONAL HIGH | "A SCHOOL–WIDE CAMPAIGN FOR READING IMPROVEMENT" | 10–12 | T–11 (11) |
| S. B. Speier<br>1062–30th Street, N.W.<br>Washington, D. C. 20007 | PHELPS VOCATIONAL HIGH | "AN EXPERIMENT OFF ERING MONETARY REWARDS FOR THE MASTERY OF 220 BASIC SIGHT WORDS" | 10 | X |
| Mr. Charles Arnett Talbert<br>2538 Naylor Rd.,S.E. Apt. 301<br>Washington, D.C. 20020 | GIBBS ELEMENTARY | "EDUCATION FOR RELEVANCE–BLACK AWARENESS" | 6 | X |
| Mrs. Martha Taylor<br>1940 Brightseat Rd., Apt. 301<br>Landover, Md. 20785 | SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH | "PERSONAL AND FAMILY LIVING BOOK AND FILM CLUB" | Jr. High | T–9 (3) |

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND: GROUP II, 1969–70

| TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS | SCHOOL | PROJECT TITLE | GRADE LEVEL | PROJECT TEAM or INDIVIDUAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Richard E. Taylor<br>5715 Blaine Street, N.E.<br>Washington, D. C. 20019 | PHELPS VOCATIONAL HIGH | "VISUAL AIDS FOR THE LANDSCAPE COURSE" | 10–12 | T–7 (3) |
| Doris S. Thompson<br>5116–11th St., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C. 20011 | KIMBALL ELEMENTARY | "OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION"<br>"WORKERS IN OUR BUILDING" | 6 | X |
| Mrs. Patricia P. White<br>2601 Branch Avenue, S. E.<br>Washington, D. C. 20020 | VAN NESS ELEMENTARY | "READING THROUGH MUSIC" | Primary | X |
| Mr. Joseph Willhoft<br>4717 Homer Ave., Apt. D<br>Suitland, Md. 20023 | PAYNE ELEMENTARY | "FILM MAKING IN THE SIXTH GRADE" | 6 | X |
| Mr. Joseph T. Wingate<br>3331–22nd St., S.E.<br>Washington, D. C. 20020 | KIMBALL ELEMENTARY | "PEAK–PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AT KIMBALL" | 6 | T–8 (6) |
| Mr. Richard C. Young<br>1514–17th St.,N.W. Apt. 2<br>Washington, D. C. 20036 | EASTERN HIGH | "A LITERARY–ARTS MAGAZINE FOR EASTERN" | High School | T–4 (2) |

# PART II

Round III of The Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program was funded by an anonymous donor.

Sponsored by

The Office of Staff Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| LIST OF TABLES | iii |
| EVALUATION SUMMARY | iv - v |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. PROCEDURE | 1 |
| Sample | 1 |
| Instruments | 1 |
| Collection of Data | 1-2 |
| Analysis of Data | 2 |
| III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 3-18 |
| IV. CONCLUSION | 19 |
| V. RECOMMENDATIONS | 19 |
| VI. APPENDICES | |
| A. Pre Evaluation Instrument | 20 |
| B. Evaluation Checklist | 24 |
| C. Post Evaluation Instrument | 26 |
| D. Creativity Impact Measure | 30 |
| E. Round III Participants; Schools; Project Titles; Grade Levels; and Team or Individual Effort | 33 |

LIST OF TABLES


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Reasons for Seeking an Award ..... | 3 |
| II. | Benefits Received from the Project ..... | 4 |
| III. | Problems Encountered in Implementing the Projects ..... | 5 |
| IV. | Problems - A Comparison of Pre and Post Responses ..... | 6 |
| V. | Reasons for the Problems of Materials ..... | 7 |
| VI. | Anticipated and Used Teaching Techniques and Procedures. | 8 |
| VII. | Expected Project Outcomes for Pupils ..... | 9 |
| VIII. | Expected Project Outcomes for Teachers ..... | 10 |
| IX. | Methods Planned for and Methods Used to Measure Outcomes ..... | 11 |
| X. | The Extent to Which Specific Outcomes Were Accomplished. | 12 |
| XI. | Projects' Impact on Certain Variables ..... | 15 |
| XII. | Response as to Continuation of Projects ..... | 16 |

Evaluation Summary
(Part II)

Title: Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program

Project location: Public Schools in the McKinley High School Area and the M.M. Washington Vocational High School

Date: School Year 1970-71

Target Population: 697 Teachers, librarians, counselors and resident specialists

Number Served: Teachers 43; Students 1100 (approx.)

Staff: Coordinated by the Office of Staff Development

Funding Allotment: $200 per teacher

Procedure:

Every full-time teacher, librarian, counselor, or specialist resident to one of the schools in the target population was eligible to submit a proposal for an innovative classroom project. The proposals had to focus on one or more of the priorities identified in the Academic Achievement Plan. A committee established by the Office of Staff Development selected the proposals that met the criteria for funding.

Evaluation Plan:

Background information was gathered through interviews, on-site visitations and seminars. The following instruments were designed by the Department of Research and Evaluation in cooperation with the Office of Staff Development:

1. A Pre Evaluation Questionnaire
2. An Evaluation Checklist
3. A Post Evaluation Questionnaire
4. A Creativity Impact Measure

All of the evaluation instruments were administered to Round III participants. The Creativity Impact Measure was also administered to the participants of Round I and Round II. Comparisons were made between the pre and post responses of the Round III participants. Comparisons were also made of the responses, on the Creativity Impact Measure, given by Round I, Round II, and Round III participants.

Results:

Teachers sought awards in order to provide: (1) additional and/or enriching experiences for the child; (2) to explore new teaching techniques; (3) and to provide additional teaching materials and up-to-date teaching aids. These were the main benefits received from the projects.

The main methods of instruction used were: individualized instruction· audio-visual aids; small group instruction; and remedial help. As a result: learning was improved· motivation increased; communication was improved; and attitudes were positively modified.

The participants felt that their projects enhanced "to some extent" most of the positive aspects of teaching and learning. They felt that their projects merited repetition. Many projects were repeated. Other projects required additional funding in order to be repeated.

Conclusions:

The result of this evaluation indicates a very positive teachers' reaction toward the program. The awards led teachers to try and experiment on innovative ideas on classroom instructions. In implementing their projects, the participants were given a small amount of funding to purchase instructional materials and other small equipment which otherwise would not be available in the regular school allotment for educational supplies and materials.

The benefits derived from the program are numerous. Teachers' creative abilities were recognized; a healthy sense of competition was fostered; diversified teaching techniques to suit particular class situations were encouraged. All these factors are essential in creating a wholesome classroom atmosphere which generally lead to a common end result--better instruction on the part of the teachers and better achievement on the part of the students.

## INTRODUCTION

This is Part II of the evaluation of the Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program (TIF). Part II covers the program for the school year 1970-71. Included also is a follow-up, through a Creativity Impact Measure, on participants awarded during the school years 1968-69 and 1969-70.

## PROCEDURE

### Sample

Participants for Round III were drawn from McKinley Tech Senior High School and its area feeder schools. M.M. Washington Vocational School was also included in this program. Every full-time teacher, librarian, counselor, or specialist resident to one of these schools was eligible for funding whether temporary, probationary or permanent. These teachers were invited to submit proposals for projects accompanied by budgets of up to $200 per teacher for materials and supplies with which to implement their projects. The proposals had to focus on one or more of the priorities identified in the Academic Achievement Plan, i.e., reading, mathematics, and oral and written communication.

From the target population 60 proposals were received from 101 teachers in 15 schools. An advisory committee of classroom teachers and the Office of Staff Development reviewed the project designs and selected those that met the criteria for funding. The panel identified and awarded 29 projects for 43 teachers. Some of these teachers worked as a team on an innovative project.

### Instruments

The following instruments were developed by the Department of Research and Evaluation in cooperation with the Office of Staff Development:

(1) Pre Evaluation Questionnaire
(2) Evaluation Checklist
(3) Post Evaluation Checklist
(4) Creativity Impact Measure

### Collection of Data

The Pre- and Post-Evaluation questionnaires were administered to all Round III participants. The Evaluation Checklist was administered to nineteen Round III participants as a follow-up to the Pre- questionnaire

to get specifics concerning the problems they indicated involving the ordering of materials. The Creativity Impact Measure was mailed to all Round I, Round II and Round III participants as a follow-up.

Analysis of Data

Totals and percentages were presented where numerical values were called for. For questions calling for first, second, and third choices a numerical value of: three for first choices; two for second choices; and one for third choices, was given to compute rankings. Means were computed for items that were rated on a scale. Comparisons were made of pre and post responses and of responses by Round I, Round II and Round III participants on the Creativity Impact Measure. Results were presented in narrative and tabular form.

The following scale is used to interpret mean values:

| Scale | Not At All | Poor | Fairly Well | Very Well |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mean Value | .0 to .4 | .5 to 1.4 | 1.5 to 2.4 | 2.5 to 3.4 |

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Pre-questionnaires were completed by thirty-six Round III participants. Post-questionnaires were completed by twenty-one participants. Some of the teachers who did not respond indicated that due to late funding they decided to wait until school year 1971-72 to implement their projects. Fifteen teachers completed the evaluation checklist.

The teaching experience of the thirty-six participants completing the pre-questionnaire ranged from one to thirty years with a group mean of 11.01 years.

The twenty-one participants responding to the post questionnaire indicated that their projects served from ten (The Environmental Chemistry Project) to 207 (The Listening Station Project) students giving a total of 1,130 students served.

The majority of the participants found out about the existence of the Teacher Innovation Awards Program (TIF) through the Central School Office or through their principals.

The three main reasons given for seeking an award were: (1) to provide an additional and/or enriching experience for the child; (2) a desire to explore new teaching techniques; and (3) to provide additional teaching materials and up-to-date teaching aides. The ranking of the reasons given on the pre-questionnaire is shown in Table I.

TABLE I

Reasons For Seeking An Award (N=36)

| Reasons | Teachers Indicating Each Rank | | | Percent Ranking 1st - 3rd |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | |
| To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child | 22 | 7 | 2 | 86 |
| A desire to explore new teaching techniques | 6 | 9 | 12 | 75 |
| To provide additional teaching materials and up-to-date aides | 2 | 14 | 6 | 61 |
| Self-developed competency in a particular area | 1 | 3 | 2 | 17 |
| To gain additional skill in a specific teaching area | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 |

The three main benefits received as a result of the projects are the same as the main reasons for seeking an award. Table II gives the breakdown of the responses received on the post questionnaire.

TABLE II

Benefits Received From The Project (N = 21)

| Benefits | Teachers Indicating Each Rank | | | Percent Ranking 1st-3rd |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | |
| Provision for additional and/or enriching experiences for the child | 11 | 6 | 2 | 90 |
| Freedom to explore new teaching techniques | 6 | 7 | 4 | 81 |
| Additional up-to-date teaching aides and materials | 1 | 4 | 5 | 48 |
| Gained additional skill in a specific teaching area | 1 | 3 | 0 | 19 |
| Self-developed competency in a particular area | 0 | 0 | 5 | 24 |

The majority of the teachers were aided by co-teachers in preparing their proposal and also in implementing their projects. In many cases a considerable amount of time was needed for implementation. This was likely due to late funding and the difficulty in acquiring needed supplies and materials. Of the thirty-three teachers who responded to this item, seventeen indicated that it required more than a month to start their project; nine participants took less than a week; and seven, between a week and a month.

Most principals and other school personnel were highly favorable in their reaction to the innovative projects. A reaction of indifference was cited by only two participants.

The main problems encountered by the participants in implementing their projects were: (1) the unavailability of materials; (2) the difficulty in ordering materials; (3) inadequate physical facility, and (4) the difficulty in integrating the project into the total school program.

Table III gives the results of the pre-questionnaire responses to the problems that were encountered by the participants of Round III.

TABLE III

Problems Encountered In Implementing The Projects (N=36)

| Problems | Teachers Indicating Each Rank | | | Percent Ranking 1st - 3rd |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | |
| Unavailability of materials | 7 | 6 | -- | 36 |
| Difficulty in ordering materials | 4 | 6 | 3 | 36 |
| Inadequate physical facility | 4 | 2 | 5 | 31 |
| Difficulty in integrating project into the total school program | 4 | 4 | -- | 22 |
| Lack of cooperation by school staff | 2 | -- | 2 | 11 |
| Little or no assistance from resource personnel | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Building repair | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Other: | | | | |
| (1) Shortage of funds | 1 | -- | -- | 3 |
| (2) Reading difficulties | 1 | | | 3 |
| (3) Security | -- | -- | 1 | 3 |
| Student apathy | -- | -- | 1 | 3 |

The participants ranked the problems again on the post-questionnaire. The responses showed very little change from those considered the main problems on the pre-questionnaire. Table IV gives a comparison of the pre and post responses.

TABLE IV

Problems - A Comparison of Pre And Post Responses

| Problems | Ranking | |
|---|---|---|
| | Pre | Post |
| Unavailability of materials | 1 | 1.5 |
| Difficulty in obtaining materials | - | 1.5 |
| Difficulty in ordering materials | 2 | - |
| Inadequate physical facility | 3 | 1.5 |
| Difficulty in integrating project into the total school program | 4 | 4 |
| Lack of cooperation by school staff | 5 | N/A |
| Little or no assistance from resource personnel | 6.5 | 7 |
| Building repair | 6.5 | - |
| Other | 8 | 6 |
| Student apathy | 9 | 5 |
| Lack of cooperation by parents | N/A | 8 |

N/A Not ranked as a problem.
- Not included on that questionnaire

The Office of Staff Development set up a checking account for each Round III participant. They had the opportunity of purchasing their own materials without going through regular school system channels as was done by Round I and Round II participants. It was thought that the checking account procedure would eliminate the problems surrounding the ordering and receiving of materials.

Analysis of the pre-questionnaire responses revealed that ordering instructional materials was the main difficulty Round III participants encountered in implementing their projects. In an effort to get to the very reasons for the teachers' problems, a questionnaire was designed to elicit responses which would delineate the specific problem areas. The responses are shown below:

TABLE V

Reasons For The Problems On Ordering Educational Materials (N=15)

| Problems and Reasons | Number of Responses |
|---|---|
| 1. Difficulty in ordering materials: | |
| Too little time between funding and implementation | 5 |
| Great length of time between ordering and delivery | 3 |
| Ordering procedures were not clearly understood | 2 |
| Lack of funds to cover additional costs of supplies | 2 |
| Decided it was no problem after all | 2 |
| Time wasted waiting for merchants to verify checks | 1 |
| Error in ordering | 1 |
| 2. Unavailability of materials: | |
| Materials were slow in arriving or didn't arrive | 9 |
| Desired materials were not in stock | 5 |
| Lack of sufficient funds | 3 |
| Materials were ordered too late | 3 |
| Too little time between funding and implementation | 2 |
| Many items requested were not on the approved list | 1 |
| Could not locate sources of materials | 1 |

More detailed explanations were given concerning the problems of ordering and receiving materials on the post questionnaire. These explanations by twenty-one respondents are given below. The frequency of responses are given in parenthesis.

1. The materials ordered finally came, but were slow in arriving (3).
2. The materials needed for implementing the project were not available upon initial order (3).
3. In some instances where orders were placed with a firm, they were referred to a local company causing a delay in delivery.
4. The order was incorrectly filled and had to be returned to the company as far away as California.
5. The materials are specially published and because of publishing difficulties and revisions the project could not be completed, but will be next year.
6. The difficulty was finding a set of encyclopedia; or reference books suited to the students' reading level that was priced within a $50.00 range.

7. The money allotted did not cover the cost of all necessary materials.
8. The problem was finding a company or firm that carried the needed materials for the least amount of money.
9. No problem or difficulty. (9)

The main teaching techniques and procedures planned to be used to obtain the project objectives and the main teaching techniques and procedures actually used were: (1) individualized instruction; (2) audio-visual aids; (3) small group instruction; (4) remedial help, and learning stations. Table VI gives the comparative responses on the pre- and post questionnaires.

TABLE VI

Anticipated And Actual Teaching Techniques and Procedures

| Techniques and Procedures | Number of Responses | | Percent of Responses | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre | Post | Pre | Post |
| Individualized instruction | 31 | 19 | 23 | 24 |
| Audio-visual aids | 29 | 15 | 21 | 19 |
| Small group instruction | 28 | 21 | 20 | 26 |
| Remedial help | 21 | 11 | 16 | 14 |
| Establish learning stations | 14 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| Trips, speakers, projects | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Teacher aides | - | 3 | - | 4 |
| Student aides | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Parent aides | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Camera, Tape recorder | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Programmed learning | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Introspection | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Fast learners | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Total | 135 | 80 | 100 | 100 |

The major expected outcomes for pupils as a result of the projects were: (1) improved learning; (2) increased motivation; (3) improved communication; (4) changed attitudes, and (5) individualized instruction. These and other expected outcomes are shown in the following table.

TABLE VII

Expected Project Outcomes For Pupils

| Expected Outcomes | Number of Responses | Percent of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| Improved learning | 33 | 20 |
| Increased motivation | 31 | 19 |
| Improved communication | 27 | 16 |
| Changed attitudes | 26 | 16 |
| Individualized instruction | 26 | 16 |
| Improved discipline | 13 | 8 |
| Improved self-concept | 5 | 3 |
| To relate learning to life | 3 | 2 |
| To restructure thinking for learning | 1 | - |
| To improve learning skills | 1 | - |
| Total | 166 | 100 |

Thirty-three percent of the participants indicated that learning was "much improved" and sixty-two percent indicated that learning was "improved". The remaining five percent did not respond to this item.

The major expected outcomes for the teachers as a result of their projects were: (1) to develop new teaching techniques; (2) to acquire greater teaching skills; (3) to organize information, and (4) to write curriculum materials. In the following table are the participants' responses to these and other expected teacher outcomes.

TABLE VIII

Expected Project Outcomes For Teachers

| Expected Outcomes | Number of Responses | Percent of Responses |
|---|---|---|
| To develop new teaching techniques | 33 | 33 |
| To acquire greater teaching skills | 25 | 25 |
| To organize information | 20 | 20 |
| To write curriculum materials | 15 | 15 |
| To develop team teaching techniques | 5 | 5 |
| To spearhead a project for primary grades | 1 | 1 |
| To bridge the communication gap between home and school | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 |

To measure project outcomes the participants used a variety of methods. The methods the participants planned to use were the ones used most often. The primary methods were: (1) teacher observation; (2) pre-post testing; (3) teacher made tests; (4) behavioral checklists; (5) attitude checklists, and (6) standardized tests. See Table IX.

TABLE IX

Methods Planned For and Methods Used to Measure Outcomes

| Methods | Number of Responses | | Percent of Responses | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre | Post | Pre | Post |
| Teacher observation | 26 | 19 | 24 | 27 |
| Pre-post testing | 22 | 15 | 20 | 21 |
| Teacher made tests | 20 | 14 | 18 | 20 |
| Use of behavioral checklist | 17 | 4 | 15 | 6 |
| Use of attitude checklist | 10 | 5 | 9 | 8 |
| Standardized tests | 9 | 6 | 8 | 9 |
| Finished product | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Outside observation | | 3 | - | 4 |
| Counselor-teacher-tutor conferences | 2 | - | 2 | - |
| Discussions, conversation with students | 2 | - | 2 | - |
| Peer evaluation | 1 | 1 | - | 1 |
| Recorded lessons and tapes | 1 | - | - | - |
| Total | 112 | 70 | 100 | 100 |

Of the twenty-one participants responding on the post-questionnaire, seventeen indicated that, in their opinion, the knowledge of innovative practices of teachers had "some" to a "great deal" of impact on the professional growth of non-involved teachers. Only one indicated that this knowledge had no impact on the professional growth of non-involved teachers.

All of the participants felt that their projects deserved extension because of the benefits to both pupils and teachers. To further illustrate the value of the projects the participants rated a list of specific outcomes of the projects for teachers and students. The obtained aggregate mean of 2.1 indicates that all of the specific outcomes were met "fairly well". The specific outcomes that were met "very well" are: (1) the projects helped to identify children's needs; (2) clues for understanding children's needs were acquired; (3) possible solutions to meet children's needs were found, and (4) varied ways of motivating children were developed. The only two specific outcomes that were rated as being "poorly" met were: (1) working relationships with parents and other community agencies were improved, and (2) school personnel was made aware of varied school and community resources. A few of the individual projects, however, were rated "fairly well" and "very well" in regard to accomplishing the two stated objectives. The rating of the specific outcomes are shown in Table X.

TABLE X

The Extent To Which Specific Outcomes Were Accomplished

| Expectations and Outcomes | Item Mean | Not at all | Poor | Fairly Well | Very Well | Number Responding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Helped me identify children's needs. | 2.6 | | | 8 | 10 | 18 |
| 2. Gave clues for understanding children's needs. | 2.6 | | 1 | 5 | 10 | 16 |
| 3. Provided possible solutions to meet children's needs. | 2.5 | | | 9 | 8 | 17 |
| 4. Developed varied ways of motivating children. | 2.5 | | | 11 | 10 | 21 |
| 5. Provided innovative teaching techniques in content areas. | 2.4 | 1 | | 9 | 10 | 20 |
| 6. Gave training in the use of devices used to measure growth of children | 1.6 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 16 |
| 7. Provided training that led to a change in attitudes. | 2.3 | | 2 | 9 | 8 | 19 |
| 8. Made all participants aware of the need for self-evaluation | 2.4 | | 1 | 8 | 7 | 16 |
| 9. Promoted better working relationships with the school staff. | 1.6 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 18 |
| 10. Improved working relationships with parents and other community agencies. | 1.2 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 16 |
| 11. Made school personnel aware of varied school and community resources. | 1.3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 18 |
| 12. Promoted a sharing of ideas, techniques, and physical resources. | 1.9 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 5 | 20 |
| 13. Helped teachers use classroom centers as a laboratory of learning rather than a beautifying fixture in the classroom. | 1.9 | 4 | | 7 | 7 | 18 |
| 14. Served as a motivator for the regular school year program. | 2.2 | 2 | | 8 | 7 | 17 |
| Aggregate Mean | 2.1 | | | | | |

Some of the participants made comments and suggestions about their projects and about the TIF Program. The comments and suggestions are listed below as quoted by the teachers. In instances where a comment or suggestion was made by more than one teacher it is noted by the number in parenthesis.

1. Increase the amount of funding so that several classes may be included and benefited.

2. I would like to see this program continue. I feel that it is of great assistance to teachers and encourages them to seek out new and innovative methods of teaching (3).

3. The materials we were able to acquire made our nursery play school a real learning laboratory for the pre-schoolers as well as the high school students in the "Creative Parents" project.

4. My project was not centered in any one classroom. The participants came from twelve different classrooms.

5. We were very pleased with the children's enthusiastic response to the "Independent Personal Reading Library". Every child showed a marked interest in the materials. They took books home every night to read to their parents. The upper grade children who served as listeners enjoyed the materials also. The children spend every free moment in the reading center.

6. I intend to begin the project again in September with a new class of children. I feel that beginning at the start of the school year will make the project do even more for the children. May I say how much I appreciated this opportunity.

7. The Teacher Innovation Awards Program idea is excellent! It is a great inspiration to a teacher to have ideas recognized. It is a thrilling experience to be able to use new ideas and to have the beautiful and new materials with which to inspire students.

8. Thank you for helping me introduce a new unit. I've been interested in it for a long time!

9. I enjoyed working with my project. I hoped that I could use the listening post in the media center, but, our school library is very small. I decided to circulate this as we do books. It worked well. If funds become available, we would like to add to our collection of tapes and recordings that would go with our listening post.

The Creativity Impact Measure offered the participants of Round I and Round II, along with Round III, opportunity to expound on the impact of their innovative projects on many aspects of teaching and learning; to give the present status of their projects; and to make additional comments and/or suggestions relative to their projects and/or the TIF Program.

The participants rated the extent to which their projects enhanced a list of variables. The list of variables that were rated are shown in Table XI with the comparative responses of the participants from each round of the TIF Program. Item number seven on the list is a negative item and, thus, the aggregate mean was computed separately from all other items.

With an obtained aggregate means of 2.3 and 2.4 the participants of Rounds I and II, respectively, felt that all variables (excluding item seven) were enhanced to "some" degree by the innovative projects, while the participants of Round III, with an aggregate mean response of 2.5, felt that their projects enhanced all of the variables "a great deal". Obtained aggregate means of 1.2, .7 and .9 for the variables in item seven indicate that the three groups of participants felt that their projects generated a "little" negative interactions on <u>these</u> variables. These results tend to support the expected outcomes. (Tables VII and VIII)

All participants felt that the following variables were enhanced "a great deal".

1. Their receptivity to new ideas
2. The motivation of students
3. The implementation of new ideas within the classroom
4. Their ability to translate ideas into action
5. Their ability to try other innovations
6. Their desire to translate ideas into action
7. Their desire to plan specifically
8. Their desire to try other innovations

Fifty participants responded to the question on continuation of projects beyond the year of funding. Thirty-six stated that their projects were being continued, while fourteen stated that their projects were going to terminate. See Table XII for the breakdown of responses by each round of participants.

TABLE XI

Projects' Impact On Certain Variables

| Items | Number of Responses | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Round I N=14 | | | | | Round II N=20 | | | | | Round III N=25 | | | | |
| My Project enhanced: | A Great Deal | Some | Little | Not At All | Mean | A Great Deal | Some | Little | Not At All | Mean | A Great Deal | Some | Little | Not At All | Mean |
| 1. my receptivity to new ideas | 10 | 4 | -- | -- | 2.7 | 12 | 6 | -- | 1 | 2.5 | 23 | 2 | -- | -- | 2.9 |
| 2. ideas for curriculum development | 9 | 4 | -- | -- | 2.7 | 7 | 11 | 2 | -- | 2.3 | 16 | 6 | 1 | -- | 2.7 |
| 3. the motivation of students | 11 | 3 | -- | -- | 2.8 | 12 | 8 | -- | -- | 2.6 | 20 | 3 | -- | -- | 2.9 |
| 4. implementation of new ideas within the classroom | 10 | 2 | -- | -- | 2.8 | 11 | 8 | -- | -- | 2.6 | 17 | 6 | -- | -- | 2.7 |
| 5. implementation of new ideas within the building | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1.6 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 1.8 | 5 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 2.0 |
| 6. positive interaction: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. with peers | 6 | 7 | 1 | -- | 2.4 | 8 | 11 | 1 | -- | 2.4 | 11 | 11 | 1 | -- | 2.4 |
| b. with administration | 6 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2.1 | 3 | 10 | 4 | -- | 1.9 | 9 | 10 | -- | 3 | 2.1 |
| c. with parents | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1.9 | 3 | 6 | 6 | -- | 1.8 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1.3 |
| d. with community | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1.4 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1.5 | -- | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1.5 |
| 7. other than positive interaction: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. with peers | -- | 2 | 2 | -- | 1.5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 1.0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1.1 |
| b. with administration | -- | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1.3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0.7 | -- | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0.8 |
| c. with parents | -- | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1.0 | -- | 2 | 2 | 7 | 0.5 | -- | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0.9 |
| d. with community | -- | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1.0 | -- | 1 | 3 | 7 | 0.5 | -- | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0.7 |
| 8. my ability to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. translate ideas into action | 8 | 5 | -- | -- | 2.6 | 12 | 6 | 2 | -- | 2.5 | 18 | 5 | 1 | -- | 2.7 |
| b. plan specifically | 7 | 6 | 1 | -- | 2.4 | 12 | 6 | 1 | -- | 2.6 | 17 | 6 | 1 | -- | 2.7 |
| c. use the tools of evaluation | 6 | 6 | 2 | -- | 2.3 | 9 | 8 | 2 | -- | 2.4 | 10 | 12 | 2 | -- | 2.3 |
| d. work with others | 5 | 5 | 4 | -- | 2.1 | 6 | 11 | 2 | -- | 2.2 | 12 | 11 | 1 | -- | 2.5 |
| e. write proposals | 6 | 3 | 4 | -- | 2.2 | 9 | 6 | 2 | -- | 2.4 | 9 | 13 | 1 | -- | 2.3 |
| f. try other innovations | 6 | 3 | -- | -- | 2.7 | 11 | 7 | 1 | -- | 2.5 | 16 | 6 | -- | -- | 2.7 |
| 9. my desire to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. translate ideas into action | 8 | 5 | -- | -- | 2.6 | 12 | 5 | -- | -- | 2.7 | 23 | 2 | -- | -- | 2.9 |
| b. plan specifically | 7 | 6 | -- | -- | 2.5 | 8 | 5 | -- | -- | 2.6 | 17 | 7 | -- | -- | 2.7 |
| c. use the tools of evaluation | 6 | 5 | 2 | -- | 2.3 | 9 | 5 | -- | -- | 2.6 | 14 | 10 | 1 | -- | 2.5 |
| d. work with others | 7 | 4 | 2 | -- | 2.4 | 10 | 2 | 1 | -- | 2.7 | 14 | 9 | 1 | -- | 2.5 |
| e. write proposals | 6 | 3 | 3 | -- | 2.3 | 9 | 4 | 1 | -- | 2.6 | 13 | 7 | 4 | -- | 2.4 |
| f. try other innovations | 7 | 4 | 1 | -- | 2.5 | 12 | 5 | -- | -- | 2.7 | 18 | 4 | -- | 1 | 2.7 |
| Aggregate Mean For Item 7 | | | | | 1.2 | | | | | 0.7 | | | | | 0.9 |
| Aggregate Mean (excluding Item 7) | | | | | 2.3 | | | | | 2.4 | | | | | 2.5 |

TABLE XII

Responses As To Continuation of Projects

| Participants | Number of Projects | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Continued | Terminated | |
| Round I | 7 | 5 | 12 |
| Round II | 10 | 6 | 16 |
| Round III | 19 | 3 | 22 |
| Totals | 36 | 14 | 50 |

The explanations given as to how their projects could be continued without funding are given below. The number in parenthesis following the explanation indicates the number of participants citing that explanation.

1. The same materials can be used without additional funds. (20)
2. With some changes we are able to continue the basic idea. (5)
3. We received additional materials from other sources. (5)
4. The children are helping with fund raising. (2)
5. Received funds from the school library fund.
6. I am using some personal funds.
7. By reproducing materials from originals.

The following are the explanations given by the fourteen participants why their projects are not being continued beyond funding year.

1. Additional funds are necessary for continuation. (8)
2. Because of staff and curriculum reorganization. (4)
3. I was promoted to an administrative position.
4. I am involved in other activities.

Seven, eight and seventeen participants of Rounds I, II and III, respectively, stated that as a result of a year's experience (more than a year for Rounds I and II) modifications had been made in their projects. The modifications cited by the participants were as follows:

1. The methods and ideas used in my project have been adopted in other classes. (3)
2. The project was designed for a small group, but has been re-designed to serve a large group. (3)
3. The project was expanded to include a greater variety of skills. (3)

4. The project was implemented by other teachers. (3)
5. We found that working with smaller groups is more profitable. (2)
6. A better process was developed for reaching pupils with reading needs.
7. We have instituted a project course of study for other teachers.
8. The alphabet is now being taught along with the phonics chart.
9. New methods of evaluating are being tried.
10. Demonstrations are held for the teachers.
11. The project as redesigned to fit the A.A.P. guidelines.
12. Sound has been added to our films and slides. (2)
13. Classroom management, teaching techniques, and curriculum have been changed to meet learning disabilities. (2)

Other outgrowths of the innovative projects were evident as stated by eight Round I, fifteen Round II, and eighteen Round III participants. They are as follows:

1. There is increased concern among other teachers concerning learning disabilities and behavior modification. (14)
2. There is increased motivation and desire to achieve among pupils. (9)
3. I have been invited to join a writing team in environmental science and one of our projects won first place at the science fair.
4. We had an exhibit at Georgetown, and some students sold their work.
5. An orthopedic and artificial limb shop is being installed at D.C. General.
6. We are presently experimenting with contract method and open classroom.
7. Some tutors have begun to work with pupils on weekends.
8. There is a possibility of a day care center being established.
9. Many of the activities are utilized as part of the A.A.P.
10. An anthology of pupils' writings is being compiled.
11. Students can progress on their own with the electronic kits.
12. A science club has been started at school.
13. Plans have been made to form an art club.
14. The administrator became aware of the pupils' progress.
15. There is greater cooperation and interaction among students.
16. Pupils are "test conscious" and better able to concentrate in all areas.
17. There is a desire for summer classes.

Comments and suggestions were given by teacher in each of the three groups. These comments and suggestions are listed separately by groups.

Round I (N=5)

1. Until filmstrip is perfected, the slides in the "Library-Jet-Age Learning Approach Project" are being used to great advantage with students, with visitors from foreign lands and with others from neighboring schools. The latter are those who want to see a media center in a classroom remodeled to house a library.

2. I enjoyed doing the project and I would like to see it continued.
3. It would be advantageous to children if primary grades were departmentalized the way project "T.M.A." was.
4. This has been a fantastically rewarding experience. My greatest joy has been in having reached the non-readers in my class and seeing them "crack the code" of reading and achievement.
5. I thank TIF many times over. The freedom to experiment has made me a more informed, flexible teacher, better able to understand and work with the children in my classroom.

Round II (N=6)

1. Such a project could be beneficial throughout the summer with very young children for reading readiness.
2. I do, definitely, plan to continue my project in ego development next year. I also plan to enlist more parent help for my experience stories.
3. I have been able to pass on some ideas to teachers in other schools.
4. I had hoped to motivate my students to read and to do some research in African cultural history. I accomplished some of this. The students are proud of their knowledge.
5. Efforts should be made to see that successful innovative projects are continued and expanded. (2)

Round III (N=15)

1. I think the innovative fund gives incentive to teachers and provides additional opportunities for students.
2. Being a TIF winner has been a meaningful experience for me. (2)
3. Thanks for your aid. Keep advertising it. (2)
4. It has been a deep satisfaction to be able to offer more to my students and to help them invididually.
5. I am grateful for the award and will continue my project with limited personal funds.
6. The self image of most of the children has improved and in addition a large percent have developed an enjoyment of reading.
7. The award increased the prestige of our department in the eyes of the students, faculty and administrator.
8. We had to overcome the initial problems of scheduling and of student apathy. Overall the project was a success.
9. It would be nice to be refunded. I found these projects to be one of the best learning devices I have encountered.
10. A new way is needed to report students' progress to parents. (2)
11. More programs of this nature should be established by the Office of Staff Development. This program has created new ideas among faculty and students.
12. Complete evaluation is difficult. I am getting individual positive reactions, but I would like to have more time.

## CONCLUSIONS

The responses indicate that the teachers were appreciative and very happy to have had the opportunity to try their own ideas in a teaching situation. They feel that their projects served a worthwhile cause, that of motivating children to learn, while improving learning. They feel that they were able to improve their own teaching skills while also acquiring additional teaching materials. The benefits received were not limited to the TIF winners and the students they served. Ideas, techniques, materials, and procedures relative to motivating and meeting the learning difficulties of students were disseminated among many non-involved teachers creating interest and desire on the part of many others to try innovative projects without being funded.

The Innovative Methods Processing Center (IMP), discussed briefly in Part I of this report, under the direction and leadership of Mr. Charles Talbert, a Round II participant, involved directly a group of IMP Teachers. These are teachers, not TIF winners, who agreed to try an innovative project during the 1970-71 school year. As a result of a proposal written by Mr. Talbert, funding was received for a three week course at D.C. Teachers College to train the IMP Teachers in preparing teacher learning packages to be used by other teachers to carry out innovative projects. The IMP Teachers received four graduate credits; $125 each for materials; and a $150 stipend. Each teacher prepared three instructional packages relating to their own project for dissemination. A display of this work was presented at the Summer Leadership Training Institute held at Rabaut Junior High School, June 28 thru July 22, 1971.

Many booklets and other instructional materials have been compiled and disseminated as a result of the TIF program. These materials were developed by the Office of Staff Development, the IMP Center, and by individual TIF winners and their students.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue the Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program.
2. Arrange the schedule for submitting proposals and awarding grants to allow each winner time to order and receive materials needed for the implementation of the project at the beginning of the school year.
3. Furnish each newly awarded participant with a compiled list of companies and firms known to stock materials and supplies needed to implement successful innovative projects.
4. Future TIF Winners should explore the possibility of involving more community resources in their innovative projects.

# APPENDIX A

## PRE-EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program
Pre-Evaluation Instrument
Prepared by the Department of Research and Evaluation, April 1970
Revised January 1971

The Office of Staff Development is interested in obtaining information from you about the project you have designed for experimentation in your classroom. Please respond to the following. Thank you.

Name _____ School _____

Grade/Subject _____ No. of yrs. you have taught _____ Date _____

1. How did you find out about the existence of the Teacher Innovation Grants?

   _____ Central school office _____ Principal _____ Supervisor

   _____ Teacher _____ Other (please specify)

2. For what reasons did you seek an award? (Please rank from the most important reasons to the least important 1, 2, 3, etc.

   _____ Specialized training in a particular area

   _____ Self-developed competency in a particular area

   _____ a desire to explore new teaching techniques

   _____ to gain additional skill in a specific teaching area

   _____ to provide an additional and/or enriching experience for the child

   _____ to provide additional teaching materials

   _____ Other

3. Who aided you in preparing your proposal?

   _____ University personnel _____ Subject Specialist _____ Supervisor

   _____ Principal _____ Co-Teacher _____ No one _____ Other (please Specify)

4. How much time will/did it take you to get the objectives and contents of your project implemented with the students?

   _____ less than one week _____ less than one month

   _____ one to two weeks _____ more than one month

5. What problems did you encounter in the initial implementation of the project? (Please rank from the greatest problem to the least 1, 2, 3, etc.)

_____ lack of cooperation by school staff

_____ student apathy

_____ unavailability of materials

_____ inadequate physical facility

_____ difficulty in integrating project in the total school program

_____ lack of cooperation by parents

_____ little or no assistance from resource personnel

_____ difficulty in ordering materials

_____ building repair

_____ other

6. What techniques and procedures will you use to obtain your objectives?

_____ individualize instruction

_____ small group instruction

_____ remedial help

_____ audio-visual aids

_____ establishment of learning stations

_____ other (please specify)

7. What are your expected outcomes?

a. Pupil

_____ improve learning

_____ change attitudes

_____ individualize instruction

_____ increase motivation

_____ improve communication

_____ improve discipline

_____ other (specify)

b. Teacher

_____ organize information

_____ acquire skills

_____ develop new techniques

_____ write curriculum materials

_____ other (specify)

8. How do you plan to determine the degree to which these outcomes are met in your evaluation of your project?

_____ pre-post testing

_____ standardized tests

_____ teacher made tests

_____ use of behavioral objectives checklist

_____ attitudinal checklist

_____ observation record

_____ other (specify)

Comments:

# APPENDIX B

## EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Teacher Innovation Fund
Evaluation Checklist

Name _____ Date _____

Check the items you consider to be contributors to the main problems concerning materials. Use the back for detail explanations.

1. Difficulty in ordering materials was due to:

____ desired materials were not in stock

____ could not locate sources of materials

____ materials were non-existent

____ too little time between funding and implementation

____ ordering procedures were not clearly understood

____ other (please specify)

2. Unavailability of materials was due to:

____ desired materials were not in stock

____ could not locate sources of materials

____ materials were non-existent

____ too little time between funding and implementation

____ lack of sufficient funds

____ materials ordered too late

____ materials were slow in arriving

____ other (please specify)

3. Please elaborate (explain in detail on the back) the main items checked above.

# APPENDIX C

## POST-EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND
Post Evaluation Instrument

The Office of Staff Development is interested in finding out how you feel about the project you designed for experimentation in your classroom. Please respond. Thank you.

Name _____ School _____

Name of Project _____

Number of Students Served _____ Date _____

PART I

1. What benefits have you received as a result of being awarded a grant. (Please rank from most to least 1, 2, 3, etc.)

_____ Specialized training in a particular area
_____ Self-developed competency in a particular area
_____ Freedom to explore new teaching techniques
_____ The gain of additional skill in a specific teaching area
_____ Provision for additional and/or enriching experiences for the child
_____ Additional up-to-date teaching aides
_____ None
_____ Other( Please specify)

2. Who aided you in implementing your project?

_____ University personnel _____ Subject Specialist
_____ Supervisor _____ Principal _____ Co-Teacher
_____ No one _____ Other (Please specify)

3. What was the reaction of the principal and other school personnel regarding your project?

_____ highly favorable
_____ favorable
_____ indifferent
_____ unfavorable
_____ extremely critical

4. What problems did you encounter in the implementation of the program? ( Please rank from greatest to least, 1, 2, 3, etc.)

_____ lack of cooperation by school staff
_____ student apathy
_____ unavailability of materials
_____ inadequate physical facility
_____ difficulty in integrating project in the total school program
_____ lack of cooperation by parents
_____ little or no assistance from resource personnel
_____ difficulty in obtaining materials
_____ other

5. What techniques and procedures did you use to obtain your objectives? (Please rank 1, 2, 3, etc.)

_____ individualized instruction
_____ small group instruction
_____ remedial help
_____ audio-visual aides
_____ establishment of learning stations
_____ parent aide
_____ teacher aides
_____ other (Please specify)

6. To what degree was learning improved as a result of implementation of your program?

_____ much improved
_____ improved
_____ little improvement
_____ no improvement

7. How did you measure your outcomes?

_____ pre and post testing
_____ standardized tests
_____ teacher-made tests
_____ teacher observation
_____ outside observation
_____ student's behavior checklist
_____ student's attitude checklist
_____ other (specify)

8. In your opinion does knowledge of innovative practices of teachers have any impact on the professional growth of non-involved teachers?

_____ not at all _____ little _____ some _____ a great deal

9. Does the project have enough value for students to merit repetition?

_____ not at all _____ little _____ some _____ a great deal

10. If you have encountered any problems in ordering materials and/or the unavailability of materials, please explain the situations here.

## PART II

Listed below are a number of statements regarding possible expectations and outcomes. Please rate each using the following scale.

| | Not at all | Poor | Fairly Well | Very Well |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Helped me identify children's needs. | | | | |
| 2. Gave clues for understanding children's needs. | | | | |
| 3. Provided possible solutions to meet children's needs. | | | | |
| 4. Developed varied ways of motivating children. | | | | |
| 5. Provided innovative teaching techniques in content areas. | | | | |
| 6. Gave training in the use of devices used to measure growth of children. | | | | |
| 7. Provided training that led to a change in attitudes. | | | | |
| 8. Made all participants aware of the need for self-evaluation. | | | | |
| 9. Promoted better working relationships with the school staff. | | | | |
| 10. Improved working relationships with parents and other community agencies. | | | | |
| 11. Made school personnel aware of varied school and community resources. | | | | |
| 12. Promoted a sharing of ideas, techniques, and physical resources. | | | | |
| 13. Helped teachers use classroom centers as a laboratory of learning rather than a beautifying fixture in the classroom. | | | | |
| 14. Served as a motivator for the regular school year program. | | | | |

## PART III

Comments: Suggestions: Use the reverse side if needed.

Prepared by
Department of Research and Evaluation
April 1, 1970
Revised January 71

# APPENDIX D

## CREATIVITY IMPACT MEASURE

OFFICE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND

CREATIVITY IMPACT MEASURE

Name _____ Date _____

School _____ Project (Name) _____

Date Proposal Was Funded_____ Date Funding Ended _____

Your candid response to this instrument will give us valuable information about the total TIF Program.

I. Place a check in the apporpriate column to indicate the extent to which your project enhanced:

| | Not Applicable | Not At All | Little | Some | A Great Deal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. your receptivity to new ideas | | | | | |
| 2. ideas for curriculum development | | | | | |
| 3. the motivation of students | | | | | |
| 4. implementation of new ideas within the classroom | | | | | |
| 5. implementation of new ideas within the building | | | | | |
| 6. positive interaction: | | | | | |
| a. with peers | | | | | |
| b. with administration | | | | | |
| c. with parents | | | | | |
| d. with community | | | | | |
| 7. other than positive interaction: | | | | | |
| a. with peers | | | | | |
| b. with administration | | | | | |
| c. with parents | | | | | |
| d. with community | | | | | |

OSD-TIF 150/

| | Not Applicable | Not At All | Little | Some | A Great Deal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8. your ability to: | | | | | |
| a. translate ideas into action | | | | | |
| b. plan specifically | | | | | |
| c. use the tools of evaluation | | | | | |
| d. work with other | | | | | |
| e. write proposals | | | | | |
| f. try other innovative projects | | | | | |
| 9. your desire to: | | | | | |
| a. translate ideas into action | | | | | |
| b. plan specifically | | | | | |
| c. use the tools of evaluation | | | | | |
| d. work with others | | | | | |
| e. write proposals | | | | | |
| f. try other innovative projects | | | | | |

II.

1. Is your project being continued beyond funding?

   Yes ____ No ____ (If Yes tell how; If No, explain why not)

2. Are there modifications being made as a result of your project?

   Yes ____ No ____ (If Yes, explain; If No, explain why not)

3. Are there any other kinds of out growth from the project?

   Yes ____ No ____ (Explain)

III. Suggestions or comments

Prepared By:
Department Research and Evaluation
January, 1971

# APPENDIX E

## ROUND III PARTICIPANTS: SCHOOLS: PROJECT TITLES: GRADE LEVELS TAUGHT: AND TEAM AND/OR INDIVIDUAL EFFORT

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III - 1970-71 CYCLE

| TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS | SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL | PROJECT TITLE | GRADE/SUBJECT | INDIVIDUAL/TEAM |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Martha Kavanaugh<br>5322 Wakefield Road<br>Bethesda, Maryland 20016<br>PHONE: 657-4126 | McKINLEY Senior High<br>2nd and T Sts., N.E.<br>William H. Rumsey<br>629-6071 | LIVING AMERICAN HISTORY | History | X |
| 2. Virginia Dougherty<br>3511 N. Nottingham<br>Arlington, Virginia<br>PHONE: 536-7119 | " " " | FUTURE CREATIVE PARENTS | Home Economics | X |
| 3. Jean W. Randolph<br>135 47th Street, N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 398-4875 | " " " | TRIP, Tech's Reading Improvement Program | ENGLISH | X |
| 4. Gwendolyn Holland<br>1808 Tamarack St., N.W.<br>Washington, D. C. 20012<br>PHONE: 829-0414 | " " " | INDIVIDUALIZING ALBEBRA I | Mathematics | X |
| 5. Howard S. White<br>2409 Lewisdale Drive<br>W. Hyattsville, Md. 20783<br>PHONE: 422-7627 | " " " | LEARNING THROUGH CONSTRUCTIONS | Science | 2 |
| 6. John W. Sperry, III<br>908 Erie Avenue, #3<br>Takoma Park, Md. 20012<br>PHONE: | " " " | " " " | " | |
| 7. Stan Boyd<br>12031 Valleywood Dr.<br>Silver Spring, Md.<br>PHONE: 942-6627 | " " " | INCORPORATING THE TEACHING OF READING SKILLS IN THE STUDY OF GOVERNMENT | History | 4 |

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III (continued)

| TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS | SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL | PROJECT TITLE | GRADE/SUBJECT | INDIVIDUAL/TEAM |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8. Ruth Byrd<br>1830 Varnum St., N.W.<br>Washington, D. C. 20011<br>PHONE: | " " " | INCORPORATING THE TEACHING OF READING SKILLS IN THE STUDY OF GOVERNMENT | History | 4 |
| 9. Mrs. John Farrell<br>1627 Montague St., N.W.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: TU. 2-9522 | McKINLEY Senior High<br>2nd and T Sts., N.E.<br>William H. Rumsey<br>PHONE: 629-6071 | INCORPORATING THE TEACHING OF READING SKILLS, etc. | History | 4 |
| 10. Jan Jakusz<br>1724 Q Street, N.W.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 462-6342 | " " " | " " " " | " | 4 |
| 11. Shendrine B. Henry<br>2718 26th St., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 529-4529 | " " " | ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTRY | Science | X |
| 12. Helen W. Holmes<br>3917 22nd St., N.E.<br>Washington, D.C. 20018<br>PHONE: 529-4205 | M.M. WASHINGTON Vocational, O St., bet. 1st & No. Cap. Sts., N. W.<br>James O. Snowden-629-6867 | REACHING OUT WITH THE BEAUTIFUL TRUTH | English | X |
| 13. Toby Levin (Mrs.)<br>3404 Curtis Dr., #201<br>Hillcrest Heights, Md.<br>PHONE: 899-1960 | " " " | INDIVIDUALIZING LEARNING THROUGH STATIONS | History | 2 |
| 14. Sandra J. Fascell<br>3421 Wisconsin Ave., N.W.<br>Washington, D.C.<br>PHONE: 966-1412 | " " " | " " " " | " | |

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III (continued)

| TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS | SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL | PROJECT TITLE | GRADE/SUBJECT | INDIVIDUAL/TEAM |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Peggy Joyce Pate<br>3400 24th St., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: LA. 9-1245 | M.M. WASHINGTON Vocational, O St., bet. 1st & No. Cap. Sts., N.W.<br>James O. Snowden - 629-6867 | A TOTAL EXPERIENCE IN CLOTHING | Home Economics | X |
| 16. Etta D. Arnold<br>4133 Lee St., N.E.<br>Washington, D.C.<br>PHONE: 396-0282 | " " " | BRINGING THE FACTORY METHOD OF CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION INTO THE CLASSROOM | Home Economics | X |
| 17. V. Susie Oliphant<br>4212 14th St., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 529-1927 | HAMILTON Junior High<br>6th & Brentwood Pkwy., N.E., Clinton M. Mattingly-620-6801 | ENVIRONMENT SCIENCE | Science | X |
| 18. Bonita J. Peeler<br>411 3rd St., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 543-7771 | " " " | YOUR CREATION: FROM START TO FINISH | Home Economics | 2 |
| 19. Richard F. Arey<br>2832 30th St., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 832-7571 | " " " | " " " | Art | |
| 20. John A. Skehan<br>3810 East Cap. St.,N.E.<br>Washington, D.C.<br>PHONE: 396-7159 | TAFT Junior High<br>18th & Perry Sts., N.E.<br>Lee Etta Powell<br>629-7821 | VISUAL LITERACY | Reading | X |
| 21. Carolyn S. Taylor<br>4403 H St., S.E.<br>Washington, D.C.<br>PHONE: 582-0630 | LANGLEY Junior High<br>1st & T Sts., N.E.<br>Margaret Murray<br>629-6121 | ACTIVITY - CENTER MATHEMATICS CLASSROOM | Mathematics | 2 |

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III (continued)

| TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS | SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL | PROJECT TITLE | GRADE/SUBJECT | INDIVIDUAL/TEAM |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22. Sondra A. Legall<br>6420 2nd Pl., N.W.<br>Washington, D.C.<br>PHONE: 829-5963 | LANGLEY Junior High<br>1st & T Sts., N.E.<br>Margaret Murray<br>629-6121 | ACTIVITY-CENTER MATHEMATICS CLASSROOM | Mathematics | |
| 23. Consuella O'Neal<br>1400 Varnum St., N.W.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: RA 3-0325 | LANGLEY Junior High<br>1st & T Sts., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>Margaret Murray<br>629-6121 | URBAN GEOGRAPHY AUDIO-VISUAL LIBRARY | Social Studies | 2 |
| 24. Roland Rier<br>5 Vee Street, N.W.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>phone: 387-4942 | LANGLEY Junior High<br>1st & T Sts., N.E.<br>Margaret Murray<br>629-6121 | URBAN GEOGRAPHY AUDIO-VISUAL LIBRARY | Social Studies | |
| 25. Purnell W. Lawrence<br>4613 Eastern Ave., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 779-2496 | BUNKER HILL Elementary<br>14th & Michigan Ave., N.E.<br>Emma M. Carter<br>629-7801 | INDEPENDENT PERSONAL READING LIBRARY | Librarian | 2 |
| 26. Claudia Thompson<br>4408 Kinmount Rd.<br>Lanham, Maryland<br>PHONE: 459-4195 | BUNKER HILL Elementary<br>14th & Michigan Ave., N.E.<br>Emma M. Carter<br>629-7801 | INDEPENDENT PERSONAL READING LIBRARY | Grade 1 | |
| 27. Purnell W. Lawrence<br>4613 Eastern Ave., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 779-2496 | BUNKER HILL Elementary<br>14th & Michigan Ave., N.E.<br>Emma M. Carter<br>629-7801 | 3 M PROJECT | Librarian | 2 |

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III (continued)

| TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS | SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL | PROJECT TITLE | GRADE/SUBJECT | INDIVIDUAL/TEAM |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 28. Katherine Cyrus<br>832 Thurman Ave.<br>Hyattsville, Md.<br>PHONE: 422-2477 | BUNKER HILL Elementary<br>14th & Michigan Ave., N.E.<br>Emma M. Carter<br>629-7801 | 3 M PROJECT | Grade 5 | |
| 29. Gloria W. Greene<br>3803 17th St., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 526-3649 | BURROUGHS Elementary<br>18th & Monroe Sts., N.E.<br>Doris H. Hundley<br>629-7014 | TURN ON - EXPRESS YOURSELF | Grade 6 | X |
| 30. Patricia A. Haring<br>3310 Ross Pl., N.W.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: WO 6-8593 | ECKINGTON Elementary<br>Quincy Pl. & First St.<br>N.E., Mary C. Thompson<br>629-6104 | LAUREATE FLEXIBLE READING | Grade 1 | X |
| 31. Janice R. Bragg<br>5264 Marlboro Pike #301<br>Hillside, Maryland<br>PHONE: 736-6721 | ECKINGTON Elementary<br>Quincy Pl. & First St.,<br>N.E., Mary C. Thompson<br>629-6104 | STATION FOR LISTENING | Librarian | X |
| 32. Melville T. Turner, Jr.<br>1325 North Carolina Ave.<br>N.E., Wash., D. C.<br>PHONE: 544-4762 | EMERY Elementary<br>Lincoln Rd. & S St.,N.E.<br>Frederick P. Baluch<br>629-6987 | INNOVATIVE ELEMENTARY PHYSICAL EDUCATION | Physical Ed. | X |
| 33. Doris Barlow<br>5311 Mohican Rd.<br>Washington, D.C.<br>PHONE: 229-6685 | EMERY Elementary<br>Lincoln Rd. & S St.,N.E.<br>Frederick P. Baluch<br>629-6987 | GETTING TO KNOW ME | Counselor | X |
| 34. Florene K. Jones<br>4122 13th Pl., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 526-0679 | GAGE Elementary<br>2nd & U Sts., N.W.<br>Mary C. Thompson<br>629-7781 | USING PHOTO-SITUATIONS TO ENCOURAGE POSITIVE SELF-CONCEPTS IN DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN | Grade 5 | X |

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III (continued)

| TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS | SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL | PROJECT TITLE | GRADE/SUBJECT | INDIVIDUAL | TEAM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35. Margaret O. Washington<br>1329 Allison St., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 526-7392 | LANGDON Elementary<br>20th & Franklin Sts.,N.E.<br>Ernest Mercer<br>629-7091 | GETTING TO KNOW YOURSELF | Grade 6 | | 2 |
| 36. Sonja H. Robinson<br>3000 7th St., N.E. #116<br>Washington, D.C.<br>PHONE: 529-0593 | " " " | GETTING TO KNOW YOURSELF | Physical Ed. | | 2 |
| 37. Moncerie J. Woolfolk<br>3938 17th St., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 832-4507 | LEWIS Elementary<br>300 Bryant Street, N.W.<br>Mrs. Evelyn Smith<br>629-7147 | NEWSPAPERS "4" READING | Grade 6 | X | |
| 38. Lucy K. Brown<br>231 Missouri Ave., N.W.<br>Washington, D.C. 20011<br>PHONE: 726-1035 | MOTT Elementary<br>4th & W Sts., N.W.<br>Arneta G. Molley<br>629-7027 | NEW ADVENTURES IN THE TUTORING OF READING | Reading Specialist | | 3 |
| 39. Winona K. Blackburn<br>3523 Porter St., N.W.<br>Washington, D.C. 20016<br>PHONE: 362-5878 | " " " | NEW ADVENTURES IN THE TUTORING OF READING | Grade 4 | | 3 |
| 40. Mary E. Stith<br>11235 Oak Leaf Dr.,#2020<br>Silver Spring, Md.<br>PHONE: 593-2891 | MOTT Elementary<br>4th and W Sts., N.W.<br>Arneta G. Molley<br>629-7027 | NEW ADVENTURES IN THE TUTORING OF READING | MIND Program | | 3 |
| 41. Maryhall F. Robinson<br>7107 Walker Mill Rd.<br>District Hgts., Md.<br>PHONE: 350-1138 | SHADD Elementary<br>56th & E. Cap. Sts., N.E.<br>Marjorie Buchanan<br>629-6931 | REINFORCING THE TEACHERS' INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM | MIND Program | X | |

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III (continued)

| TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS | SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL | PROJECT TITLE | GRADE/SUBJECT | INDIVIDUAL/TEAM |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 42. Arabelle Finney<br>2012 Perry St.,N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 529-8076 | WOODRIDGE Elementary<br>Carlton & Central Aves.,<br>N.E.<br>Barbara K. Stathis<br>629-7087 | WORD POWER | English | 2 |
| 43. Andrea Harper<br>233 Channing St., N.E.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>PHONE: 832-2437 | " " " | WORD POWER | Second Grade | 2 |

104